DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 318 IR 004 103

AUTHOR	Lilley, Dorothy B., Ed.; Correll, Lou, Ed.
TITLE	Learning Resources; Proceedings of a Conference (Commerce, Texas, December 15, 1975).
INSTITUTION	East Texas State Univ., Commerce. Center for Educational Media and Technology.
PUB DATE	Jul 76
NOTE	129p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Certification; Conference Reports; Guidelines; *Instructional Materials Centers; Media Specialists; Public Schools; School Libraries; *Standards; State Licensing Boards; *State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This conference report contains the texts of speeches delivered at a December, 1975 conference on Texas learning resource programs. Complete transcripts are provided for speeches on: (1) district and school site media programs; (2) guidelines for developing learning resource centers; (3) standards for learning resource programs; (4) the role of the State Board of Examiners in the certification of learning resource specialists; (5) state priorities; and (6) school certification programs that affect school media centers. Appendiixes include a copy of the conference program, a list of questions to be addressed at the conference, and a list of conference participants. (EMH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED129318

LEARNING RESOURCES

Proceedings of a conference held
December 15, 1975 at
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Edited by
Dorothy B. Lilley
and
Lou Correll

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Center for Educational Media and Technology

July, 1976

IR004103

CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii

Chapter

I. Introductions and Welcome 1
by Beatrice Murphy

II. Overview of the Conference 4
by Dorothy B. Lilley

III. Media Programs: District and School 8
by Earle Williams and Lou Correll

IV. Guidelines for the Development of Campus . . . .
Learning Resources Centers 20
by Mary Boyvey

V. "The Challenge of Standards" 34

Zella Lewis 37
Ed Burleson 50
Lyle Froese 53

VI. "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Proposed Learning Resources Specialist Professional Certification?" 60
by William E. Truax

VII. "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Priority of Instructional Resources?". 68
by Barry Thompson

VIII. "Public School Instructional Resources System and State Priority". 78
by George Lipscomb

IX. "School Certification Programs that Affect School Media Programs" 88
by Harlan Ford

X. Group Feedback and Summary 105
by Bruce Ledford and Mary Wheeler

Appendixes

A. Program. 114

B. Questionaire 116

C. Puzzle 117

D. List of Conferees. 118

Preface

We are pleased to be able to present the proceedings of the Conference on Learning Resources. All of the papers contribute toward a concentration. They focus on the need for full-scale learning resources programs at the individual school level in order to improve education in Texas. There is a unity of purpose and concern apparent in these papers that the audience seemed to share.

We, at the Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University, are pleased to have been honored by outstanding speakers from the Texas Education Agency, from public schools of Texas and from our own university. We wish to express our thanks, not only to our speakers, but to the members of our audience, educators from Texas universities, regional service centers and public schools, whose presence added dignity and meaning to the conference.

Beatrice Murphy

Beatrice Murphy, Director,
Center for Educational
Media and Technology

I. Introductions and Welcome

Dr. Beatrice Murphy, Professor and Head, Center for Educational Media and Technology

We at the Center for Educational Media and Technology are delighted that you would come today to study the guidelines and standards of media programs. We know we picked one of the worst days and worst weeks in the entire year. It just happened to be that way. We know you made a sacrifice to get here and we are so pleased that you are interested enough in the standards and guidelines to make that sacrifice. We are also pleased that some of our administrators are taking time out from their busy schedule to be with us.

I would like to present to you at this time our Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Richard C. Meyer, who, in turn, will present our president.

Dr. Richard C. Meyer, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Thank you. It's a cold day, but to use a phrase at some risk of sounding corny, "Your presence does warm us and the campus! We're pleased that you are here." I told Dr. Murphy that I was going to ramble around awhile, but Dr. Murphy knows [illegible] particular personal interest in the kinds of topics you are discussing today, and I would applaud each of you as well as our very fine Center for Educational Media and Technology for making some effort to move ahead in this whole business of media, learning resources centers--these kinds of things, not only on public school campuses but on college and university campuses as well. I would like to stick around because your topic is of great interest. If we do anything in our separate jobs, it is to produce the better product that we call the learner. I applaud you for taking your time: I applaud our center here for trying to get you together. All of us will be watching very closely what happens with the particular topics that you are discussing. I welcome you. We're glad that you're here. For an official welcome, we're fortunate to have with us today President F. H. McDowell. I'd like to introduce him to you at this time, President McDowell.

President F. H. (Bub) McDowell

Thank you,Dr. Meyer. Good morning! It's good to see all of you. On behalf of the East Texas State University, it's my pleasure and privilege to welcome you today to our campus for this very important Conference on Learning Resources, sponsored by our Center for Educational Media and Technology. We're certainly proud of Dr. Murphy and her staff. We think they do an outstanding job. We certainly congratulate them on being willing to sponsor this conference and invite you people who are here today to take part and exchange ideas and information concerning this area. It is wonderful for you all to be willing to come to the campus for what I call professional development.

We think it's a great idea and we encourage our departments and people to sponsor such conferences and take part in them because we feel like this helps the educational system when we take time to work together on new ideas and new programs so that we can do a better job for our universities. I know that you today will focus on the issues that are essential to your jobs and to your schools, and looking at your schedule I can see that this conference schedule certainly supports that belief. I hope that your visit today here will be professionally rewarding and enjoyable and we hope that you will return to the campus on future occasions. You are always welcome. We always welcome friends from other campuses to come to this campus for such a conference. We're delighted you're here. We hope you feel at home. We hope this will be a great day for you. Thank you for letting me just say this word of welcome to you.

II. Overview of the Conference

Dr. Dorothy B. Lilley, Professor, Center for Educational
Media and Technology

Welcome! I guess you know that I am delighted to see so many of you here. I remember that a few weeks ago this conference was just an idea flying around our faculty meeting, and today our idea is realized with all of you beautiful people sitting out there. You come from very diverse positions and locations. I want to talk a little bit about who is here. You'll notice we have this map of Texas with little flashing lights and that it shows the geographic distribution of the conferees. I must say that I was a little disappointed that no one came from El Paso or the Big Bend country but the turnout is rewarding.

Registered for this conference are people from three of our ten regional centers: Region Seven, Region Ten, and Region Twenty. There are people here from about forty different independent school districts and from fourteen institutions of higher learning. The Texas Education Agency is represented and we have students from ETSU and Texas A & M. From the regional centers,I may not be absolutely accurate, but from a quick look at the list,I believe we have people who are involved with media and with curriculum. From the public schools, we have superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, print and non-print media co-ordinators and supervisors, curriculum supervisors, and special education directors. From the institutions of higher education, we have deans and directors of media and curriculum. There are fourteen colleges and universities represented, nine with learning resources programs, that is educational programs, and five without educational programs. You understand what I mean, I'm talking about formal educational programs in the areas of learning resources. As far as I know, we have just one program for education of media aides. We are delighted to have TCJC represented in this regard. And we have five, or possibly more, heads of learning resources educational programs; and, of course, as I mentioned before, some students.

I would like to express our appreciation to the Texas Education Agency, first of all for being so supportive in this program that we feel is timely. TEA has sent top people here to provide programs and information for you today. We'll introduce them later. Secondly, I want to compliment them on what has gone before. TEA has taken the leadership in providing us with guidelines and in indicating learning resources as a priority in the state of Texas.

We also want to express our appreciation to the representatives from the public schools who are participating in the program today. We have one disappointment in that regard. Mrs. Phillips called last night and told me that something had turned up unexpectedly in the Dallas school district and that they would be unable to leave the school district today. For that,we are very sorry. However, it's like a lot of other things, there is seldom a disappointment that doesn't have some advantage. It will give a little more time to other members of our panel. Now let's look at our program. First will be a presentation related to the national standards: Media Programs: District and School by Dr. Earle Williams and Dr. Lou Correll. Secondly, a presentation related to state standards by Dr. Mary Boyvey, Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers; then our panel that I mentioned earlier, with Robert Titus presiding: Mrs. Zella Lewis, Co-ordinator of Library Services at Tyler; Mr. Ed Burleson, Superintendent of Schools at Lindale and Mr. Lyle Froese, Director of Instructional Media at Sherman. Three different types of personnel will be sitting here on this panel. You will get a chance, at the end of the program, to interact with them. We'll have just a little more time than we might have had if we had had the five speakers as planned.

At noon, there will be a buffet luncheon and speakers Dean Truax and Dr. Thompson. Both of them are on the State Board of Examiners. After lunch, we will have two more speakers, both from TEA: Mr. George Lipscomb, Director of Instructional Resources and Dr. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development. To wind it all up, we'll have summary reports by Dr. Bruce Ledford and Dr. Mary Wheeler, both on our ET faculty. I hope that throughout you will have time to interact, to talk with people and to ask questions because we feel that we really have the experts on the subject here in this room today.

I have made, with some help from my colleagues, thirteen questions. You will find the list in your kit. These probably are the types of questions that you will have in mind when you think of the learning resources priorities and programs in Texas. I hope you will look at them and think on them, but also, flip over the sheet and write your own questions so that when the opportunity arises for you to ask questions of the speakers or of the panel you will be able to get the answers that you came here to get. Throughout the day, we will have coffee in the rooms wherever we are. You will just go and get it whenever you care to. See Appendix B for thirteen questions.

III. Media Programs: District and School

Dr. Earle Williams, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational
Media and Technology

Dr. Lou Correll, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational
Media and Technolgoy

Dr. Lilley:

I would like at this time to introduce two of our faculty members Dr. Earle Williams and Dr. Lou Correll who lead you right into the first part of our program.

The following overview of Media Programs: District and School was mediated by Dr. Williams' personal collection of satirical slides used to illustrate the standards set forth in the publication.

Dr. Correll:

Good Morning--

As you see from the program, it is our pleasure for the next few minutes to discuss national guidelines for school media programs. This is a copy of the publication that sets forth these guidelines. It's called Media Programs: District and School

In 1969, the American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association (which since 1971 has been called the Association for Educational Communications and Technology) published a document known as Standards for School Media Programs. Both AASL and AECT brought strong traditions of promoting effective guidelines for media programs to this collaborative effort. Continuing concern of the two organizations for excellence in media programs throughout the nation has now been demonstrated in a second publication, copyrighted 1975. Once again, mutual intent to sustain and improve school media services at every level of operation has been expressed. The publication I just mentioned, Media Programs: District and School, is the result.

Now, Dr. Williams and I decided we too would collaborate. We thought it would be appropriate to continue the print/non-print cooperative effort, and he agreed to mediate any comments that I would make. Earle, I'd like to say right here, please feel free to incorporate your slides at any place you think appropriate. Now back to Media Programs: District and School.

Simply stated, focus of these guidelines is on the user of media programs. The central concern is the quality of the educational experience for the learner. As stated in the document, quality district and school media programs undergird and extend educational opportunities by providing the resources for teaching and learning. Qualitative goals are set out; criteria are offered for district and school media programs that make exemplary educational strategies in order to reach the many needs of the specific publics to be served. This document promotes flexibility in practice based on intelligent selection from many alternatives, considering relationships of school media programs, district media programs, regional programs, state programs, as well as networking potential.

In order to create better educational opportunities, the national standards point out that we must strive to develop comprehensive systems that meet the needs of students of differing abilities, backgrounds, and interests, enabling them to adjust to and to influence the changing society in which they live. Media programs which reflect applications of educational technology, communication theory and library and information science contribute at every level, offering essential processes, functions and resources to accomplish the purposes of the school. These guidelines deal with five major areas: programs, personnel, operations, collections and facilities.

PROGRAMS

Let us think first of programs. It is established that the media program represents a combination of resources including people, materials, machines, facilities and environments, as well as purposes and processes. The combination of these program components and the emphasis given to each of them are determined by the needs of specific educational programs involved. It is important that media professionals, curriculum consultants, teachers and learners jointly design instructional systems in such a way that content and method evolve together. This "scientific instructional design" results in a more effective allocation of both the human and the material resources of the educational program.

Guidelines for the district media program state that technological potential in a school district is best realized when the instructional applications of media and technology are placed under the administrative structure of a district media program.

The district media director is placed in a key role in decision-making related to setting goals, analyzing curriculum, selecting instructional modes and establishing and maintaining responsible evaluation processes.

School Media Program

Guidelines for the school program stress direct services to students and teachers, media collections development and instructional design that fulfills the educational goals of the school. The school media program is conducted under the direction of a media professional, usually a media specialist with knowledge of education and with leadership and managerial competencies. National guidelines refer to this person as "head of the school media program."

Regional Media Program

The regional media program exists to provide services which school districts cannot provide for themselves or to strengthen school district programs by supplementing existing services or offering superior alternatives.

State Media Program

Media programs at the state level are the responsibility of the state educational agency. The state board of education generates creative policies for media programs and is responsible for making recommendations for legislative action that insures provision of resources necessary for media-program development.

Networks

The guidelines encourage participation in networks in order to increase users' access to information and information sources. The network furnishes access to information or knowledge not readily available to region, district and school programs.

PERSONNEL

Personnel for creating and maintaining educational media programs are identified in terms of professional staff and support staff. The professional staff include media specialist and what the guidelines refer to as "other media professionals."

Media Specialist

Here is the way the guidelines describe the media specialist. This person has broad professional preparation in education and media, has appropriate certification and possesses the competencies to initiate and implement a media program. The media specialist holds a master's degree in media from a program that combines library and information science, educational communication and technology and curriculum.

Other Media Professionals

The guidelines state a person also qualifies as a media professional when he or she has had academic preparation and experience in an area of educational technology or information science, such as instructional development, instructional television, computer technology, media production, programmed instruction and technical processes. The standards state that while not all media professionals need hold certification by the state, their programs of preparation must include curriculum and instruction (and other appropriate areas of professional education) as well as their media specialties.

The support staff of the media program includes technicians and media aides. Preparation for these positions is acquired either by specialized training or on-the-job experience.

Media Technician

Media technicians have competencies in one or more fields such as graphics production and display, information and materials processing, photographic production, operation and maintenance of instructional equipment, television production and installation of system components.

Media Aide

Media aides have secretarial and clerical competencies that enable them to perform tasks related to the ordering, receipt, maintenance, inventory, production, circulation and utilization of materials and equipment.

District Media Director

Guidelines are also established for those in position of leadership in school media programs. The district media director is a media professional chosen on the basis of breadth of knowledge and experience in media programs; managerial, administrative and supervisory competencies; and concern for the fulfillment of the purposes of education. This person occupies an important position in bringing to the educational program the full application of media and technology.

Head of the School Media Program

The media specialist designated as the head of the school media program is selected on the basis of managerial and administrative competencies coupled with a wide knowledge of media and expertise in instructional design. This person is responsible for developing, administering and implementing a full media program.

OPERATION

Qualitative and quantitative recommendations are made in regard to the various operations of the media program. These operations include planning, budgeting, purchasing, production, access and delivery and maintenance.

Planning

Planning for media programs is a cooperative effort of district and school media professionals working with other professional members of the educational staff and the users of media resources. This requires an understanding of user needs and interest and instructional design, a clear definition of program goals and objectives and a knowledge of available and needed resources.

Budgeting

Budgeting is the financial aspect of planning for the media program. The budget identifies specific program objectives based on user needs, identifies resources required to accomplish these objectives, and presents the financial requirements for supplying these resources.

Purchasing

When it comes to purchasing, the entire operation of supplying the nonhuman resources of the total media program calls for business acumen coupled with a knowledge of materials and equipment and a sensitivity to the overall program goals as reflected in the budget.

Production

Media production services provide for the preparation of materials not available from other sources and for the creation of materials by students or other users to enhance self-discovery and expression. Production services at both the district and the school levels are considered.

Access and Delivery Systems

Access and delivery systems are the means by which students and teachers obtain materials, equipment and other resources at the time of need or desire. Reminder is made that the best access and delivery systems require the least conscious conformity by the user.

Maintenance

Maintenance calls for diverse operations extending from cords of projectors and spines of books to nonfunctioning projectors and tape recorders. Purposes here are duel. Good maintenance contributes largely to the comfort and efficiency of learners, teachers, and staff. Good maintenance also plays an important part in economical, efficient management.

Public Information

Guiding principles are stated in regard to keeping the public informed. Activities are suggested for the purpose of carrying out the communications process by which the media staff provides and transmits information about media-program objectives and functions in order to develop public awareness and support.

Program Evaluation

Then, of course, the purpose of evaluation is to assess the degree to which goals and objectives have been met and to determine effectiveness of the program elements in relation to their achievement. Such evaluation results in the continuation of a program element, in its modification, or in its discontinuance. The guidelines emphasize that this is the only professional basis for such decision.

COLLECTIONS

Strong media collections provide the primary means for teaching, learning and interest fulfillment. A school's media collection represents the essential information base of the instructional program. The guidelines state that school media personnel assume responsibility for insuring that users have ready access to the material and equipment they need or want.

Selection Policies and Procedures

The media selection policy reflects basic factors influencing the nature and scope of collections such as curriculum trends, innovations in instruction, research in learning, availability of materials and equipment, the increased sophistication of youth and the rising expectations of teachers and students. The selection policy reflects and supports principles of intellectual freedom. Procedures for handling questioned materials follow established guidelines and are clearly defined.

Media Evaluation

The process of ~~examining~~and evaluating materials and equipment being considered for purchase is continuous and systematic. Published evaluations, including those in reviews, recommended lists and standard bibliographic tools are used in selection. Materials and equipment within existing collections are monitored and examined continuously in order to replace worn items and to withdraw out-of-date and inappropriate items.

FACILITIES

Facilities for media programs should support and enhance program activities and contribute to their efficiency of operation. The collection gains power with good facilities; equipment gets more use; production increases; and learners return readily to the media center. All users prefer surroundings that enable them to complete tasks in a satisfying way, whether they are staff members, teachers or students.

The basic assumption made throughout this document is that the quality of contact users have with materials, machines, personnel and environments determines the quality of the media program. Lists of desirable and observable activities are provided to illustrate what users may be found doing in quality media programs.

In this publication, Media Programs: District and School, AASL and AECT call for media programs that are user-centered, that promote flexibility in practice based on intelligent selection from many alternatives and that are derived from well-articulated learning and program objectives. The purpose of these guidelines is to expand the possibilities for media program planners and to provide a tool for broadening concepts of the potential that media programs offer for improving the educational experience. And finally, the challenge is made to all media professionals to use the document in their own ways to increase educational opportunities at all levels through the design and implementation of effective, responsive media programs.

Well--I guess when you ask Earle to mediate a program, you'd better see how he plans to do it--but then, what would you expect from a "clown." Now get him to tell you about that act.

Will you please look in your packet and find the green sheet that says at the top, "The National Standards Puzzle." On the bottom of the sheet, you will see listed the areas spoken to by the guidelines: programs, personnel, operations, collections, and facilities. Then, within each of these areas, you will notice the various elements. We hope that this will help to summarize for you this overview of the present national standards for school media programs. If you look in the puzzle, you will find each of the elements mentioned in the standards. Earle will underline the publication's title and then we'll not spoil the fun for you by giving you the location of other terms. However, sometime during the day or after you return home, you may want to see if you can find all the elements we've talked about and that are listed at the bottom of the sheet.

See Appendix C for the puzzle.

IV. Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers

Dr. Mary Boyvey, Program Director, Division of Instructional Resources,
Texas Education Agency

Dr. Lilley:

Thank you, Drs. Williams and Correll. Audience, you can never again say that you have not heard what's in the standards. Previously, they may have been just a book that you have flung onto the desk. Now you know what the standards are all about. What is also important to us is how the state guidelines articulate with the national. To talk about our state document, Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources, we have with us today Dr. Mary Boyvey. Dr. Boyvey is Program Director of the Division of Instructional Resources at the Texas Education Agency. Most of us who have been in Texas for awhile recognize Dr. Boyvey as a leader in the learning resources area, both print and nonprint. She has many, many times come to our different meetings to inject a little spirit, and we're all very proud to have her speak on the state-level guidelines--Dr. Boyvey.

Dr. Boyvey:

This is the warm welcome which I always associate with East Texas State University. I'm sure that one of the criteria for employment here must be the ability to convey warmth, friendship, charm, interest in and concern for visitors.

Add these traits to professional expertise and competence and I wonder how the President completes a faculty team here. But perhaps he has a supply of these new tranquilizers you have been reading about. They don't relax you, but they make you enjoy being tense (laughter). In case any of you here today are like the voter who wrote his congressman, "I beg you not to improve my lot any further, I can't afford it," you will be pleased to know that I have changed the topic of my speech. On a university campus, it seemed that I should have something that sounded more erudite, more scholarly than "Guidelines to Campus Learning Resources Centers." So, I would like to give you my new topic: "Systems Approach Applied to Learning Resources Program Development." Now that sounds pretty good and I will connect this up at the end incase you forget the topic (laughter). I'm not really a systems expert. In fact, I'm more like the new minister who was invited by the local Kiwanis Club to join their ranks. The membership secretary was teasing him a little bit and said, "Now you know it's a rule of the club to have only one representative from each profession. And it seems that this club already has a member who is serving in the category of pastor." The membership secretary glanced at the gentleman and said, "the only profession really not represented that I can think of at the moment is dog catcher. Would the pastor mind?" "Well," was the Reverend's reply, "where I came from, I was known as the shepherd, but of course you know your group best." I have only one more throw away line and it's to remind me of the time element. One of the common factors in success is the alarm clock. So, mindful of my time, I would like to express sincere admiration and respect to the staff here at East Texas State University who have made this conference possible. I am quite impressed with the thought, effort and planning that has gone into this undertaking. And I am delighted that college faculty are bringing this amount of leadership to our profession. And now I shall try to be candid and stay with my assigned topic. I am sorry that I don't have Dr. Correll's speech. As I said, she said it all so well and I would like to apply some of those same things to our state guidelines. But let's start with a rhetorical question. Why the new Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers? One of the obvious answers is that the ESEA Title II requires an annual review and/or revision of state guidelines. Another reason, again obvious but not too significant, would be to keep pace with changes in materials resources available for educational programs, new presentation forms, increasing options in materials and related equipment, as well as rising costs. A third and more important reason stems from an impact of a kind of ecumenical movement beyond where we were in 1965. I think we've come to a deeper understanding of the roles and contributions of various kinds of personnel, including professional and para-professional staff, and a broader acceptance of the concept of staff differentiation as basic to program realization. Still another reason lies in the fuller recognition of the role learning resources programs play in the schools and districts of which they are a part and the concern for approaching state representation in the context of tailoring the learning resources program to its particular institutional setting. Then there is the growing recognition of the inter-relationship, both existing and potential, among learning resources programs at all levels--the school, the district, the region, the state and the networking potential, with again, the concern that these kinds of relationships need to be built into, reflected and addressed in any statement of guidelines. And finally, there is the concern for a broader conceptualization of the learning resources program which is probably the most challenging of the reasons for this new document. Actually the writing committee was rather like the chairman of a board of directors who appeared one day before them in order to solve the matter of commercial competition. "What we need," he said, "is a brand new idea that has been thoroughly tested." Unfortunately this idea simply is not available in our profession at the time, so we have to build on it. I would like to make a few specific comments on the Guidelines.

The "Foreword" states the intentions to expand the school library in a transitional step toward a state-wide, coordinated effort to access materials and services for the purpose of facilitating learning. The purpose is not to set forth a fixed, static future, but rather to indicate movement along a continuum. Even the format of the document-and I hope all of you have seen this document and have a copy of it--even the format of the document suggests the changing nature of the program, the need for revision, the careful study and adoption or modification of new developments, technical, philosophical, humanistic. The bulletin was published in hole-punch form so that it could be changed easily, so that it could be added to, expanded, could have pages replaced.

The "Introduction" proposes several principles applicable to all schools with the emphasis placed on qualitative concerns. It underscores the need for flexibility in order that the learning resources program can respond to the needs of a specific school and can relate to the district and/or region. Remember success comes in cans. Failure comes in cans.

The first chapter, "The Learning Resources Center Program," presents the key idea of planning and cooperative planning among various media program facets. For instance, the general learning resources program and the special education resources system specify vertical planning involving school, district and region. Planning is in a broad context here which assumes needs assessment, the determination of goals and objectives, program evaluation, and ultimately leads toward more effective accountability.

Chapter 2, "Resources," includes rather straight-forward statements. They concern the collection, selection, evaluation, organization and record keeping.

Chapter 3, "Facilities," treats the planning involved in both new and remodeled quarters to reflect the unique needs in specific campus units. Flexible space that can be arranged and rearranged to accommodate revised and up-dated curriculum designs, different pupil populations and technological progress. No single facility design can be prescribed for all schools. Nor can a single-facility-design be recommended for schools of similar size, grade level and pupil population.

Chapter 4, "Financial Support," is perhaps the most traditional section and almost suggests a line-item-budget type of operation. Although one of the basic principles states that the learning resources program budgetis based on the school's goals and objectives and utilizes some system of accountability for cost effective analysis, little consideration is given to relating resources to the outputs of the program. I would almost make this same criticism of the national standards. We talk a good story, but we haven't gone quite far enough in this respect.

Chapter 5, "The Learning Resources Staff," tends to overcome some of the weaknesses attributed to the budget section by describing the competencies and the services expected of the specialist serving at the district and campus levels in the general standard or in the special education system. Additional paraprofessional staff, both instructional aides and clerical aides, are described in the staffing pattern and specific roles are delineated. Volunteers, both adult and student, are included in the scope of staffing patterns.

Appendix A, "The Planning Guide," is a simple and easy approach to initiating planning. There is a one-page profile sheet. I didn't have time to make out a puzzle, but this one looks as much like a puzzle as the one we received in the last session. I did bring some extra copies. Those of you who have copies of the bulletin and do not have copies of the profile sheet, and wish some, will be able to pick them up here. If there are not enough, we will be glad to supply them if you'll drop us a post-card. This one-page profile sheet, designed to be used with the quantitative levels which are placed in the Appendix, enables a learning resources center person, staff, or a school committee to determine the current status as well as desirable and achievable levels that they would like to meet at some future date. In other words, we would like to close the gap between what is and what ought to be. Now, much of this is subjective judgment, is intuitive, is the best thought coming in from the faculty. So it is rather simple in that respect, but it does begin to suggest some of the areas that schools are moving in. And as educators move toward acceptance of and proficiency in program-planning-budgeting systems or systems analysis, more sophisticated and complex management techniques are available. The Guidelines do not provide case studies. In other words, they give us no examples or illustrations of good or outstanding uses of staff, other resources and facilities. Indeed, norms, both in Texas and at the national level, relating resources to outputs of the program are sadly lacking. This brief overview of the Guidelines is an introduction to (1) learning resources programs today and (2) learning resources programs tomorrow, or to express this idea in the vernacular, "Where are we and where do we want to go?"

LaVerne Morrison, of the Instructional Resources Division, has described and visualized the composite of a typical day in a learning resources center. Now remember, this is a composite and its kind of like the statue on top of the capital, some people are better, some people are not quite up to this, but everyone is on the continuium moving toward more effective education. This is our presentation on pretty much what is going on in the schools today.

(Slide/tape presentation).

We thought perhaps this would be a better way to show you some of the things that we think are going on. The presentation was cartooned but we tried to bring out the different activities. And certainly the presentation gives evidence of on-going and desirable activities: some planning, maybe a little intuitively, some participation with other faculty members, and a caring specialist. There are concerns with a limited budget, a limited staff and limited space. Some indication is given of individual personalities here, the characteristics of junior high school pupils, the unexpected happening, a bit of pathos, a dash of humor and, throughout, that special thrill of pleasure and excitement that permeates the successful learning resources program. The question before us now is: In a situation like this, how much do we want to change and in what direction? Any value in the Guidelines restsin the use that is made of them at the campus and district level to achieve programs for individual students.

The practitioner will not find in the *Guidelines* a how-to-do-it manual nor will he find instant solutions to the many problems that face educators today. And perhaps a word of caution might be well here--how not to use the standards: To wave the quantitative levels in the faces of administrators with a statement to the effect, "It says right here I ought to have--" is a guarantee of program block, frustration and little progress. The *Guidelines* emphasise planning and flexibility as considerations for any campus program. Well, everybody plans, don't they? But, the *Guidelines* are leading toward planning in a broader context and as a management technique. Other forces are also operating today to encourage, to push, to mandate in this direction, and this planning is going to require needs assessment, goal setting, objectives and program evaluation. Those of you who have completed your ESEA Title IV B or Title IV C application have seen the handwriting on the wall. It is clear that the federal programs have been moving in a series of steps through Title II and now into Title IV toward Management by Objective, MBO, if you want to sound like one of the initiated. The determination of a performance measure at the beginning of the year includes the selection of strategies designed to attain that objective and a final evaluation of the measure in terms of "fell short," "attained," "exceeded." The Texas Education Agency in May, 1974, distributed *The Evaluation Plan Model*. It proposes seven steps in the planning process. Now, if you don't have this particular one, don't write for it because a revised and expanded version of this planning model will be available in the spring. Watch for the title of it which will be Planning, Budgeting, Evaluation Guidelines. The Division of Instructional Resources, the University of Texas, Graduate School of Library Science and several of the Regions have provided leadership in in-service programs on "A Planning Process for School Media Programs for Learning Resources Personnel at the Campus Level." Now this planning process offers a set of instruments to assist in the uniform application of assessing needs, collecting data so that we can relate the priorities that have been set to try to relate the use of priorities to the use of system output in order to see if we can find a relationship between the percentage of values of the staff, the faculty and the students at the secondary level place on a service and what it actually costs to produce that service. Because of the interest and the potential expressed in the campus-level instrument, the Texas Education Agency contracted with Dr. James Liesner last year to produce a parallel set of instruments that might be used by district or regional programs. Some of you participated last month in the first in-service program on the planning process at the district/regional level. So you see that many forces in addition to the Guidelines are nudging learning resources center personnel along this planning continuum. We're asking you to move into a more sophisticated use of business techniques, management techniques, to produce more accountability. People in the community, legislators, other people who are working to get their priority ahead are also demanding to know of us: What are you producing for the money spent? All right, some early adopters in the state are out in the front using rather sophisticated business techniques already. Some of us are at various stages of beginning to accept this and starting to implement it. Some are reluctantly or openly rejecting right now the application of business techniques to education. We're someplace on a continuum of planning and the direction seems to be toward more sophisticated planning, but if planning and accountability are not your cup of tea at the moment, the Guidelines can be used to support your particular commitment--more utilization of a wide variety of media, a more humanistic approach to education, a more effective career education program or a more individualized learning resources program. I'm trying to say that regardless of the Guidelines' emphasis on planning, they will probably be used to the extent that they serve individual aims. Consequently, before anyone uses this document as an authority, he may need to do a little soul searching. If we decide what our commitments are, then we might have some insight into how we, as individuals, can use the document. A good homework assignment might be to determine where our priorities are, then look at the Guidelines to see how they could be used to develop that which we feel is of paramount importance. To be honest with you, building educational programs and learning resources programs will continue to depend, to a large degree, on best guess, political expedience and personal prejudice as much as on know-how. The shape of the learning resources program will be influenced by the values and beliefs held by those in control. They will reflect the determination of the powers that be. Learning resources programs of the future will spend a great deal of their energy justifying what they are doing in terms of the assumptions that they are making since little data exist that tell us in any definitive sense what knowledge is of most value, where people learn best or how people learn.

And so, if administrators are going to change priorities in favor of the media program, they must be convinced that the assumptions made about teaching and learning that are supported by the learning resources program are simply better than those that are in common practice now. Supporting just one strategy is probably dangerous, so watch the bandwagon. A much safer and more effective position is to sell learning resources programs because they provide better ways and means for a wider range of teaching and learning strategies and fit many philosophical frames. I believe the building of strong media programs is facilitated when media professionals or learning-resources-center professionals use a softer, more thoughtful approach to building programs that continually strive to establish a sound, empirical base. We should make our decisions on the best information and research available and avoid being associated with one particular camp. I'd like to conclude this presentation with a fable and this will tie up my speech title and it will support one of my MBO's that relates to planning. It also goes back to the title. I hope you haven't heard this. This is a systems approach applied to learning-resources-program implementation and it's a fable.

Once upon a time there were two pigs; a third one had gone into marketing and disappeared. The two pigs were faced with the problem of protecting themselves from a wolf. One pig was an old-timer in the wolf-fending business and he saw the problem right away. Just build a house strong enough to resist the huffing and the puffing he had experienced before. The first pig built his wolf-resistant house right away out of genuine, reliable lathe and plaster. The second pig was green at this wolf-fending business, but he was thoughtful. He decided that he would analyze the wolf problem a bit. He sat down and drew up a matrix, that's a blank sheet of paper, you know, and listed the problems, analyzed the problems into components and possibilities of wolf strategies, listed the design objectives of his wolf-proof house, determined the functions that his fortress would perform, designed and built the house and waited to see how it worked. He had to be an empiricist for he'd never been huffed and puffed at before, you remember. All this time, the old pig sat laughing at the planner pig and declined to enter into this kind of folly. He had built wolf-proof houses before and he had lived and prospered, hadn't he. He said to the planner pig, "If you know what you're doing, you don't have to go through all that jazz." And with this, he went fishing, or rooting, or whatever it is that pigs do in their idle hours. The planner pig worked his system anyway and designed for predicted contingents.

Sure enough, one day the mean old wolf passed by the two houses. They both looked the same. After all, a house is a house. He thought that a pig dinner was just what he needed. So he walked up to the first pig's house and uttered a warning to the old-timer which was soundly rejected as usual. With this, the wolf, instead of huffing and puffing, pulled out a sledge hammer, knocked down the door and ate the old-timer for dinner. Still not satiated, the wolf walked to the planner pig's house and repeated his act. Suddenly a trap door in front of the house opened and the wolf disappeared neatly into a deep, dark pit, never to be heard from again.

Now, unlike Aesop's fables, which have only one moral, this story has three:

First, they're not making wolves like they used to;
Second, it's hard to teach old pigs new tricks; and
Third, if you want to keep the wolf away from the door, you'd better plan ahead. Thank you.

Dr. Lilley:

Thank you very much Dr. Boyvey, for a fine presentation.

V. "The Challenge of Standards"

Dr. Robert Titus, Professor, Educational Media and Technology

I don't intend to spend a long time introducing our guests. I know you are here to hear what they have to say and not to hear too much about them. Our three guests today have been active in education for many years in different capacities. Mrs. Lewis has been (and I am never quite sure which way to go with this, from top to bottom or from bottom to top)--she has been from a classroom teacher (you can put your own sequence here as to whichever you think is more important) to her current title as your program indicates, Coordinator of Library Services for the Tyler Independent School District. I think most of these people feel that their teaching years are as important as many other things they have done. She has been very active in Texas in library organizations as well as in other professional organizations. She has been on the TCTA board and on the TSTA board in District Eight and District Seven; she has been TSTA President of District Eight; she has been on the board of the TLA; and she has helped with several professional studies of different sorts over many years. She has been on the Texas State Library Advisory Board and Chairman of the Library Supervisors of Texas. So I think that she is one, at least known to me personally, of the few library people who has had or shown professional leadership roles in both the non-public-school library as well as the public-school library fields.

She has been legislative chairman for the TASL for several years. When I asked her what she would like me to say here in thirty or forty-five seconds, the loudest word that came over the telephone was "Grandmother!" I suspect that if you want to see what kind of grandchild she has, she will show you that too.

Our second speaker this morning, Mr. Burleson, as you can see, is Superintendent of Schools at Lindale. For those of you over the state who may not be acquainted with East Texas geography, this is a fine little community just north of Tyler. He has had, again, many years of experience, beginning as a classroom teacher and as a coach. He was the principal at Crockett for six years, where he did coaching also. Then he spent four years as Assistant Superintendent at Mount Pleasant. He is currently, and has been for five years, Superintendent at Lindale Public Schools. He is a member of professional organizations and has been an active participant in those and also has been on the TASA study group on school finances, so he should be able to answer some of your questions on how we are going to pay for some of these things.

To represent our classroom teachers--I guess all of these can represent our classroom teachers, but kind of from the professional media, the non-print side--is Mr. Froese, who is currently, as you can see from your program, Director of Instructional Media for the Sherman Independent School District. He got his degrees in Kansas and came south to get a little less of the winter climate. He did graduate study in media at the University of Kansas and Kansas State College at Pittsburgh, Kansas. He began his career as a classroom teacher in Kansas City, Kansas, public schools, which at the time he started, would compare rather similarly with the Dallas metropolitan area. Then he moved to being a TV studio teacher in Labette County (in Kansas) Educational Improvement Center. He came from there to the Sherman Independent School District in 1970 as their Media Director. And since then, he indicated to me he gets a little bit of this and a little bit of that to do, so I'm sure, he may want to mention what he is actually doing now. He is currently working on an accountability project with Region Ten service center. I think, with these three people that we have, we can really get a cross-section of points of view in regard to our major topics. I hope now you will make notes and questions because each of these has a rather short presentation and they are expecting you to ask questions. I don't expect they'd be opposed to an idea or two since you have not had a chance to give these yet. We just might pull all these together here for this morning's presentations too, since one of our guests was unable to come. We can just cover the whole realm here, from the state level to the classroom level, of different points of view on our topics. Our panelists will speak in sequence, and then we will take your questions.

Mrs. Zella Lewis, Coordinator of Library Services,
Tyler Independent School District

The questions we discuss today will never be finally resolved, because new devices and man's hunger for knowledge will constantly demand revisions and new decisions. But it is as interesting as unfinished gossip and is basic to the teaching learning process. My remarks and conclusions are mine. They do not necessarily reflect those of my administration, my district or my friends.

If I had a slogan or a title, it would be "We've come a long way--maybe" since a standard was a silk pin-up or a colored banner of one's favorite knight or the symbol which brave soldiers defended until the death. Today standards are written rules, guidelines, models, goals, aims, which organizations use to serve the different groups over a state or a nation in rendering appropriate and comparable services. In the academic world, actually there can be no national standards because there is no national curriculum and so observing nationalstandards is voluntary. A standard document can not, of course, have all the details that each institution related to it will need. Standards can not be regarded as a Bible, perhaps more as a constitution to be interpreted, or as a base which contains the necessary elements for excellence. We might even call it an "e pluribus unum" hub for action.

Standards are, whether voluntary or demanded by an organization, very helpful in providing some degree of equal educational opportunity across our state. Trust Texas to connote a cooperative, democratic, self-reliant, divergent way of life, so we call them "guidelines." After careful study of many state guidelines, like Mary Laswell,I'll take Texas's because they show a greater awareness of current needs for flexibility. I find Southern Association and ALA guidelines more traditional and very slow to change. The key for Texas guidelines, I believe, is access. These guidelines furnish encouragement for school districts of all sizes by having four levels of accomplishment, four aims to work for. Whatever situation exists in any school, in any size town in this state, the guidelines can help support the learning experiences of boys and girls.

Let's take a quick look at four elements which ALA, Southern Association and Texas standards require although they do not use the same terminology. ALA speaks of personnel also "support personnel." TEA refers to "staff." Southern Association uses "personnel." The second thing listed is materials. ALA refers to "collections." TEA uses "resources." Southern Association says "materials." For funding, different names are used, also different amounts, sometimes no amounts. The fourth thing is space--called facilities by all three.

Perhaps there is no hierarchy of importance among the four categories. An elementary librarian may have expressed the best place to be in this circle by saying that she chose to be an elementary librarian because she could always find a place to park. But whether you are the superintendent, the coordinator of library services, the learning materials center director or what you are, perhaps the best job to have is the one that you would do whether they paid you for it or not.

There are several positive effects that I believe standards, national and state, have had on learning resources programs in Texas. They may be minimal or middling or maximum. They may be infinitesimal or excellent, but they are occurring.

ALA and Southern Association standards or the present guidelines which Texas has set up remind us of Browning. They are within our reach, but they still exceed our grasp. If changing enrollments and climbing prices could stabilize, we could reach them sooner, but we do feel that we have some systematic progression and there is some satisfaction in that.

Research has been done three times by TASL in the last five years concerning learning resources programs. And despite remarks about federal aid to education (with many expletives added) much money has been channeled into learning resources programs in this state and has made a noticeable change. Most school people thank God in both upper and lower case letters for this money because it has helped the learning resources center program. It has also quickly produced some acute needs. Over forty-three million for Title II in Texas seems a significant amount, even to some government spenders. And it has strengthened Texas local budgets for learning resources. In some cases, it has doubled the local effort;

in others it has multiplied it by ten times. The provisions of Title II have been brief, explicit and regular, and it has pushed all twenty-three of Tyler's campuses far beyond the Texas requirements for collections of books and periodicals since 1965.

A second change has been the impetus to establish central learning resources centers where none existed, to accelerate services at the building level where they were in name only, and to achieve excellence for a few districts. Many districts have made concerted efforts to guarantee access to more resources through the districtwide media center or through their regional service center. Even arrangements inside learning resources centers have changed. Alongside books, there are now book bags and filmstrips, cassettes and picture kits. We no longer expect the shelves to look "even" when we arrange them. A few systems have satellite collections in buildings.

A third change is staff. The terminology has altered greatly. Librarian has come to be a "see" reference in Education Index. It is interesting to study the varying attempts to make the title precisely reflect the job responsibilities. You may now be any of these people: an instructional technologist, a learning resources center director, an audio visual specialist. You may have a materials center, a retrieval center, a learning resources center, a library. You may have instructional design in your plans. You may have a clerical aide, a clerical assistant, or a media aide. Whatever terminology you use, we're all going to end up initials! We'll probably be LRS's, IMS's and so forth. But it does appear that new technology and new standards have demanded more staff and/ or machines.

Minimum Foundation provisions soon become exhausted, and after that, the only means for financing personnel is local funds or a philanthropist. Efforts throughout the state have increased since 1965 according to figures taken from Texas Education reports which superintendents turn in at the end of each school year. It is a joke among library coordinators in Texas to say, "We started with seventeen elementary schools each." In Tyler, we were fortunate; we started with only seven and now we have only two large ones or three small schools apiece. The tragedy is that some librarians still have seventeen schools apiece, or no coordinator, for elemntary schools; and in some places a coordinator is "it." She has no one to serve. She has the schools, but no professional personnel as supportive staff at the campus level.

Texas also has more library supervisors or coordinators, people who can tie together the work of campuses and make it more effective, who can take many of the details from a learning resources center director at the campus level and make services more economical, faster and more effective for an entire ditrict. When I began this responsibility in 1961, there were only five library coordinators in the state.

Now there are about forty with fifty different titles and job descriptions.

The fourth change relates to architecture. We have made some progress in location of the facility as well as shape, size, temperature and light control. Carpeting, carrels, acoustical materials and more suitable furniture are considered.

Open concepts and efforts toward individual study demand, besides a differentiated staff and different architecture, local production, easy access to many materials and the correlation of various media. Teachers and administrators must be knowledgeable about resources. They must learn to identify information needed for a facet of instruction, to recognize related information when it is encountered, to be familiar with the organization of resources and the effective way in which it can be used to support teaching and to help boys and girls become independent learners. We are also learning to be more relevant in total planning. It has not always been through choice. We started with NDEA when we had to specify funding, put down objectives, the method to be used, the materials and staff needed and then have an evaluative instrument. This has been good. At least a few districts now use computers for ordering and inventory, and many more have started a cost analysis. It is very good to have exact, definite information which shows that books no longer cost $1.98, that magazines no longer cost $5.00, but $19.50 or $25.00.

We have had to re-focus some of our methods, some of our ways of handling materials, of deleting the unimportant and adding facets as they become realities. We have discovered that as we have been able to give more services, classroom teachers have begged for still more services. Too often we are not able to give additional services because of multi-school or no staff.

Service to users and the utilization of materials has shifted. Now we begin our services in kindergarten and assist nursery school teachers in choosing fine picture books. No principal ever comes to me anymore and says what one did when we started, "Third graders don't belong in the library." By that time, they know how to run it! Special education students come as often as others. Partially sighted have print materials furnished for them. It doesn't matter where the person falls in the curriculum, there have been services provided for him, not just for those who tend toward the scholarly.

In our system, users retrieve information from periodicals at least ten times as often as they do from books, even paperbacks. One of our English teachers requires three types of media for any oral report. And so you can see that an Instamatic camera, the Visualmaker and the Thermofax are very popular tools for students as well as for teachers.

One aide in each of our high schools spends all her time handling audio-visual services. Several years ago, in view of the shift in the use of materials in our system, we replaced the old circulation report with one we call our Media Use Record. There we list the number of times each type of media is used--filmstrips, books, periodicals, pictures, soundfilms. We also put down, as accurately as we can, the number of times that the learning resources center director and the teacher sit down to plan together. We try to record every time one of our staff, whether professional or supportive, handles bulbs, machines, cords, any of these things, so that we can talk intelligently to our administration about staff needs. We recently had a change in high school principals, and the first question he asked me was, "What do you need with two extra people in the library? What do they do?" He doesn't ask that anymore. He's now saying, "Do you think that we might could get a third aide next year?"

We are the maintenance department's best customers for shelves, nooks, reading benches, magazine shelves between windows, behind doors. The next place for shelves is from the ceiling because of our limited space, but we've tried to repond to the growing needs. When we could not get more space, we have improvised, and sometimes it has been a very happy situation, if crowded. So in the effort to gear services to this media-immersed generation of students, we have found that it challenges our possibilities in hardware and policies in staff and budgeting.

Staff preparation has also been affected. At least on paper, our emphasis is now on competency-based and multimedia proficiency. The new Texas Guidelines, which had some feed-in from learning resources specialists, reflect awareness of the insistent demands of our electronic society and speak to them. There will also be certification for the audio-visual specialist and for support staff. I am very pleased to know that there is a community college here today that offers a course for library aides or assistants.

These are some positive changes that standards and federal funds have affected to some degree. As enrollments and technological changes come, we will have to refocus them, of course, if education is to remain vital. I do think our Texas Guidelines are open-ended enough, reflect enough awareness of the staff needs, possibilities of technology, and of the differentiation that can be done in teaching that they're going to be useful for a long time. Ivan Southall suggests, "Is there ever any end? Is any answer permanent? Is any conclusion final? Ideas and men grow only through change and so we anticipate it.

I see five problems relevant to standards and circumstances. First, all guideline figures are arbitrary. They are not based on research about how much of what type material is enough. We really don't know. Some figures may be too high, some may be very low in a few years. If we begin to keep records of what we find to be sufficient for the demands of the teaching-learning experiences, perhaps we can make some bases on which to change our guidelines in the future.

Another problem is that current teacher training does not require competency in the use of media. Some teacher training institutions urge, insist, suggest, and cajole their education majors into taking this, knowing full well that it is a must for effective teaching in today's world. It is so directly-related that we must keep working in all facets of education preparation to be sure that teachers and learning resources specialists can be professional partners growing out of their mutually supportive preparation.

A third small problem exists. It is that all regional service centers do not furnish the same services in relation to these needs.

Still another dilemma is that feasible financial provisions for staff are not made at the state level. The Guidelines phrase that reads, "the school boards assume the responsibility" is too burdensome for local districts. New Texas law mandates money for Plan A, for the deaf, for compensatory education, but specifies only superintendents and classroom teachers as required staff. In our state, there are only twelve districts which have a learning resources specialist on each campus, plus at least one (May, 1973).

Fifty-three other districts have one learning resources specialist on each campus. Some of them are in small towns; some are fortunate enough to have an oil field on the campus in the district. This means that in this affluent state, sixty-five out of 1,104 districts furnish full-time professional learning resources specialist services on a campus basis. The fact is that some of those have some teaching responsibilities, even though called a full-time person because they spend more than half their time in the library area. So "we've come a long way--maybe" when 1,039 out of 1,104 districts do not have a professional learning resources specialist on each campus or have them only at the secondary level, to help materials become helpful to users.

The impact of federal funds and standards is too small for the current educational needs, and the gap between the needs of modern learning-resources-center users and the ability of the majority of Texas school districts to supply these remains a yawning chasm. Many districts plan and assess their needs but their efforts are frustrated and impeded by the scarcity of funds available for that part of education which affects every student, not just some, not even many, but all. The Minimum Foundation Program did furnish, if a district chose, one learning resources specialist per twenty classroom teacher units out of five special services but such a division of funds soon became exhausted. Because of accreditation requirements, districts have placed learning resources specialists on secondary campuses and provided few or none on elementary ones. Or if they had learning resources specialists on each campus, it was at the sacrifice of health and physical fitness programs or the fine arts that give an added dimension to human life. Local funds almost always supplemented Minimum Foundation Program monies.

We are therefore compelled to say that over twenty-five years of Minimum Foundation Program did not supply enough learning resources specialists in Texas schools for the most effective learning situation. The phrase that the local "school boards assume the responsibility" for adequate learning resources programs is a weak point in the new Guidelines. The new school finance legislation holds the possibility of securing more learning resources specialists in Texas public schools, but it is remote since it is not specified as a basic position and is entirely the choice of each district. Only time will tell.

And so I conclude two things: neither the addition of federal funds nor the impetus of standards has resulted in maximum improvement of instruction for Texas boys and girls. Texas Guidelines can be a step forward. They are forward looking and cognizant of developing media. Instruction can be markedly improved under them if staff is specified by the Texas Education Agency as a basic position on each campus in this state, but the Texas Education Agency can implement only as the legislature directs; therefore, we have a responsibility to the boys and girls of Texas, both the Texas Education Agency and we as individual educators, to see that this is achieved as soon as possible so that every student whether he is in a small district or a large district will have the opportunity to become independent in using all types of materials to make learning really vital to him.

Mr. Ed Burleson, Superintendent, Lindale Independent School District

I'd like to preface my remarks by saying that I, as one school administrator in the state of Texas, am completely sold on the library and media servies as being vital in terms of support to our total instructional program. However, I would like also to say, and I speak from the standpoint of the administration, (as Mrs. Lewis has so ably pointed it out in terms of standards today) that there are problems, that we, as administraters, particularly central administrative people, superintendents, budget officers and school board members are facing, in the state of Texas today, from the standpoint of finance. I think most of you are familiar with this. But just let me briefly touch upon the problems. You know we are no longer on the old CTU (classroom teacher unit) allocation based upon ADA (average daily attendance), we're now confronted with personnel units. We no longer have our bonus units. The superintendent, the classroom teacher, the superintendent's secretary, clerical people are all personnel units with pro-rata percentage charges, the librarian, librarian's aide, teacher aides, all the auxiliary para-professional units, likewise. Compounding this problem now if you're not aware of it, I think it would behoove us this morning to point out that we are being penalized in vocational education, in terms of the full-time equivalancy. The length of time that a youngster is in a vocational program is taking away from these units. As a consequence, to make a long story short and bring a whole ball of wax down and deposit it, we've got a real, real problem in the state of Texas in terms of financing our units, our support units, however much we are sold on them. Because we, in the central administration, with school boards, are confronted now with assigning priorities, and of course the operating cost, as you are all aware, not only in your programs but school-wide is compounded for the most part, in the last three years is tripled. Now this is in terms of keeping the lights on, heating your buildings, providing the bare essentials, and unless you are a budget-balanced school, you've got real, real problems. So I would just ask you today, each of you, to have sympathy with you administration, to have sympathy with your superintendent, with your school boards, knowing very well that you need additional people, that you need the additional dollar in your library budget, in your media budget, but this is a real problem for them likewise. What's in the future? I don't really know. I've served on the TASA Study Group for School Finance at TASA TASB Convention in San Antonio this year. You hear all different kinds of comments. Everybody's got a different idea of what will be. I don't think anybody really knows. This is from the governor's office down to you, me, anyone you talk with. So with this, Dr. Titus, I think now I will conclude. I think you see why now I feel a little nervous being the only administrator and having to say these things to a group of librarians, and believe me I know your problems. My director of library services, Virginia

Baker, is here today. She knows my feelings on this. In Mt. Pleasant, I worked with Faynelle Taylor. She was director of library services there for four years. She knows this. So I personally am library oriented. I know the value. Yet, when I sit down in the chair, the problem is mammoth. Having said that, Dr. Titus and Mrs. Lewis, I'll conclude, sit down; but ask again, please understand our problem.

Mr. Lyle Froese, Director, Instructional Media,
Sherman Independent School District

In the introduction, Dr. Titus was talking about some of the responsibilities of media people and some of the things I've had to do. The media person does a lot of things. He's the guy with the camera around his neck who might be out on the school farm doing closeups on a de-horning experiment. I thought that was pretty gross and I asked the teacher about it, and he said, "We do even worse things than that." You know what they do to some of those little calves over there; that's terrible. That's one of the jobs of the media-type person. I've got three things to say. It didn't take me long; I came to Texas and found that you have to have three points for everything. So here's number one: quantities and qualities in our standards of setting up programs in media. We talk about qualities, and quantities, but what is sufficient? I think this question has already been asked this morning. Do we really know what it takes to do the job? In many cases, we can't even find people who will tell us what the job is, let alone what it's going to take to do it. And so, therefore, when we're looking at standards or when we're looking at quantities and qualities, an administrator will look at the numbers and play the numbers game but the media person, the educator, the person who works with the children, the learners, are not sure that these quantities and qualities are really the proper ones.

Secondly, on curriculum, we have technical specialists in media. We have very excellent media producers. We have slick operators, people who can work with lip-sync film making, people who can put together a three-screen presentation with six carousel projectors but what about the curriculum? What about the instructional program that is supposed to be paramount? What are the goals of that particular program whether it be a science program, a social studies program, or an agriculture program? In other words, can we get from educators, from curriculum specialists, specifications of program goals, and learner objectives so that we can do slick productions that will allow the student to get involved in this learning activity and come out where he needs to be. I can spend a great deal of my time in the production laboratory and I feel as though I can produce with the best of them but unless I know what the teacher has in mind at the beginning, I have wasted a lot of my time. So I'm asking media people to become involved in curriculum. It is very important for that campus media specialist to become so familiar with the curriculum for that campus that when something comes across the desk, a reference to a new publication, new resources, he immediately says, "I know where we can plug that in," because "I know what is expected at seventh-grade math or physical science at the tenth-grade level." Now if that media specialist does not know the curriculum, is not aware of the program goals, there is no way that that person can be the true specialist that he or she needs to be. Dr. Boyvey pointed out that our recent publications are good, but yet they're short of learner-orientation, and that's true. They're short of the statement that says here's where we want the student to be at the end of the particular lesson, at the end of a year or even the end of his formal education. Until that time comes, we're going to have a difficult time justifying people, time, funds, software and hardware to try to develop an effective instructional program. And third, there is accountability. Accountability is something that you and I are going to spend a lot of time with. If you went through Title IV, part B and part C, you got a taste of it. I think my second most favorite activity is probably being locked up in a room and having to fill out Title IV, part B and C and listening to John Denver records at the same time. I tell you that is just a taste of what's coming. Accountability--we've messed up a lot in the past and we're paying for it now. A few people knew what was happening early and they got in on the ground floor. I thank our regional service center for helping us get involved in accountability at an early stage. We were ready for it, and we did the needs assessment. We went to our community. We asked them "What are the kinds of things you want your children to be able to do when they get out of school?" We established some goals; we established priorities; we asked our instructors and our classroom teachers to identify program goals and learner goals. Now we are in the process of evaluation, and that's a part of that accountability thing too! Program monitoring under accountability. After you have determined what it is that you want to do, and you've designed some type of a delivery system to get there, then someone is going to have to monitor the program. That could be a media specialist, it could be a completely different person with a different title, but somebody has to see that what you said you were going to do is in effect getting done. That planning model for evaluation which is being revised right now will become a very important part of this program monitoring. Continual evaluation--whether or not it will ever be cost/effective; I don't know. It's very difficult for education to bo so. But we can get closer to it if we specify where we are going and develop delivery systems to get us to the end point. That can become effective. Cost-wise, I don't know. Where do we stand? I think we've already heard this morning. It's going to take state legislation. It's going to take federal legislation, because I doubt if we're able to do it on our own. Our legislatures today are saying, "Look we gave you a lot of money before. What did you do with all that ESEA Title II and III? What did you do with all that money from NDEA and Title 1, ESEA, and now we gave you, you name it, we've had them." They're asking us, "What did you do with all that money?" And we're asking them for more today. So we do have to be accountable to our legislators who are going to react favorably or unfavorably to our proposals. But it will take, in our state of Texas, a very concentrated push by your professional organizations, and each of you belong to several, I'm sure. And each organization has an arm of legislative workers that can work with their legislators and their particular proposal. I urge you to get involved in this. But also be able to answer some of these hard questions about what did you do with the money we gave you last time? You're going to be asked that. You'd better have an answer for it. We're in the process of self-evaluation right now in Sherman. We're doing both the TEA and the Southern Association at the same time and that's a bitter pill to swallow, two at a time. It's tough. We're not seeing any surprises, because we had somewhat of a systematic plan before the self-evaluation. We're learning, though, that we have to introspect; we have to ask ourselves many questions in our self-evaluation and make many plans for the future in a community that is not entirely stable, in a community, probably much like your own, that can change very rapidly. These questions and the answers to these questions are going to help us make plans for the future.

So, I don't know what a media specialist does. He has to be somewhat of a curriculum specialist, he has to be a technician, he has to know the ground wire from the hot wire on an audio cable. He has to know how to unjam a film projector. And there are days that I feel like a media person is a guy whose moodstone ring never gets beyond brown. Just once, I would like to see it turn a little bit toward the blue. Thank you.

At luncheon--Dr. Dorothy B. Lilley

I hope you are enjoying your luncheon. I don't intend you to stop just because I'm getting up. I would like to take this time to recognize the people at the head table. There are a couple of gaps: the Dallas Independent School District guests, as I mentioned earlier, could not come; and Ed Burleson, Superintendent from Lindale, could not stay for the luncheon. We should have seated here some ET faculty who are on the program.

On my extreme right, President "Bub" McDowell; seated next to him, Dr. Mary Boyvey from the Texas Education Agency; next to her Zella Lewis, Coordinator of School Libraries from Tyler. On my left is Dr. Beatrice Murphy, Director of the ET Center for Educational Media and Technology; Dr. Richard Meyer, ET Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Harlan Ford (who will be speaking this afternoon) from the Texas Education Agency; Dr. Donald Coker, ET Assistant Dean of the College of Education and Certifying Officer here at East Texas; Mr. Lyle Froese, Director of Instructional Media at Sherman and Mr. George Lipscomb, Director of the Division of Instructional Resources at the Texas Education Agency, who will be speaking immediately after lunch. And now Dr. Inez Johnson, Associate Professor in our ET Center for Educational Media and Technology, will introduce the two other persons, our luncheon speakers--Inez.

Dr. Inez Johnson

It isn't very unusual to attend a luncheon and have a guest speaker; but, it is a little unusual to have two speakers. And today I think we're fortunate in our selection. Our first speaker is Dr. William E. Truax, Dean of the College of Education. Dean Truax came to East Texas State in 1950 as Associate Director of Student Personnel and Guidance. While serving as Dean, he has been active in teacher education at the state level as a member of the State Board of Examiners.

He is also a member of the commission to set up new standards for teacher education. Dean Truax has provided leadership in professional organizations. He is a former president of Texas Association of Deans of Colleges of Education, a past president and present executive director of Texas Personnel and Guidance Association and a former national president of STATE. We feel privileged to have Dean Truax with us today to speak on the topic, "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Proposed Learning Resources Specialist Professional Certification?" I now present to you Dean William E. Truax.

VI. "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Proposed Learning Resources Specialist Professional Certification?"

Dr. William E. Truax, Dean, College of Education,
East Texas State University

Thank you, Inez. It's a real delight to be here, especially to visit with some old friends. George Lipscomb, I have known for many, many years, as a matter of fact, since I first came to the state. And one of George's protégés is getting his doctoral degree at the commencement this year. I was just telling George about that. Jack Gilliam has had an illustrious career in his field of guidance and he owes an awful lot of it to George Lipscomb it seems to me; and I'm sure that Jack would appreciate that and appreciate my saying it. How does the State Board of Examiners feel about the LR certificate? Before I can deal with this question very adequately, I think I should try to give you a little bit of background of history which will indicate where we are right now.

I've been in Texas and it's the second time--and incidentally, I'm one of the unusual Texans; I came back here by choice. That's something some of you people can't say. I came here in 1941 the first time and left, and then I came back because I wanted to come back, and I'm always delighted to come to East Texas and be part of the educational scene here and throughout the state. One thing that has always characterized education in Texas, seems to me, is the fact that it's changing. I feel this is good. I've always been very proud of the fact that Texas has been changing. I feel that we have been making significant progress in education. We've been doing a lot of things that a number of other states haven't been doing.

Now all of these changes we've probably made have not been good. As a matter of fact, I was telling Barry Thompson the other day that some of my colleagues and I had made some changes in this institution when we first came here that we wish we could change back. I mean Bob probably sat down in his office and watched us make some of these changes, or suggest some of them, and thought we were a bunch of damn fools; and I think sometimes we were. We did some foolish things, but we did some good things too, I hope. That's the sort of thing that has happened in education in all of Texas, and I think some of the changes have been very significantand some of them have not been so good. I know some of you have been impatient with some of the things that have taken place in Texas, and I want you to know that I have been impatient too. But I think that a lot of the work that has come about in this state has come about through hard work and the concern of a number of people. There have been many task forces and commissions that I've servedon, and I've been discouraged with the progress or lack of progress apparently some times that we were making, but all in all, it's been very good.

As far as this particular situation is concerned, the State Board of Education in 1969 authorized a task force to study preparation and certification of professional personnel in Texas. This task force with 35 members was representative of the total profession in Texas. We met regularly about once a month for two and one-half years studying information gathered throughout the state through position papers, study guides, conferences and all sorts of things. There were over a hundred position papers written during this time. There was a series of two or three regional conferences to share information within the state regarding new developments in teacher education. I remember one of the first significant contacts I had with Harlan Ford about 1969 when we were talking at one of the Mineral Wells Conferences about reconstitution of teacher education. I guess you remember that. Mineral Wells Conferences haven't been in Mineral Wells for over 15 years, but we call it the Mineral Wells Conference every year. (laughter) I don't know why we do that, but at any rate, I remember at one of the Mineral Wells Conferences, I presented a proposal for the guidance certificate, and I had one in one pocket which was a 60-hour program, and in the other pocket, I had a 30-hour program. I saw the superintendents who were sitting on the Board of Examiners and college presidents who had come up the educational hard way, and they didn't seem very sympathetic when the visiting teachers asked for a 60-hour program, so I put the 60-hour program back in my pocket and got out the 30-hour program, and that was the one that was adopted. You might say we're still living with it though.

The visiting teachers were in somewhat worse shape than we were. But at any rate, these conferences and so forth brought together in 1971 and 1972 as many as 1,000 educators to talk about the problems of reconstituted teacher education and the whole business of certificates. In the mean time, the Teacher Education Certification of Student Teachers Act was passed, and that had an impact on the organization of the commission and committee efforts. Also, it had an impact on the State Board of Education and State Board of Examiners. Then in 1970, the Texas State Teachers Performance project was initiated by the Texas Education Agency. This project had some very interesting implications. There were several significant ideas--two big ones--we trust that seemed to have had an impact on education throughout the state at that time. One was, that teacher education should be performance based, and number two was, that the setting for teacher education should be the educational cooperative or the teaching center, which would involve the local school district, the college, university and educational service center in the community. This was impacted with other ideas, some not so big and some pretty big too. But at any rate, we still have living with us today the concept of the teaching center. Performance-based education for everybody didn't seem to fare quite so well, but it's still alive and kicking.

This commission and committee, of course, kept working, as I said for two and one half years, and I guess we ran out of money. We were charged with developing new standards and we developed some. Some went over well and some didn't go so well. That's been the progress or characteristic of a number of things we've done in the state by various committees and commissions. When you expose ideas to the public at large or expose them to the profession at large, you don't get everything you want. I remember in building the first wing of this building when I was dean of students here; we did all sorts of surveys and asked people what they wanted and so forth. I remember what Bill Jack told me; you know, of course, when you try to get something done, you have committes or commissions working on it; and you have to make a lot of compromises. Well, we had to make a lot of compromises in this building. And I was lamenting about that one day in the faculty lounge, and Bill Jack, a professor of English said, "One thing, Truax, guys like you have to realize, you have to be satisfied with things that are slightly screwed up." And I guess that's right. Well, some of the things we might have done in the committee and commission were slightly screwed up, but I think we did make a significant amount of progress.

We did develop some new standards, but we didn't get to the most important kind of standards, at least very deeply. We talked about them on a number of occasions, but we didn't get into them very much. Those were the programatic standards. We were trying to set up a total scheme for education in Texas and a total group of programatic standards for various kinds of things. But this didn't stop the development of new certificates. We know that since that time, we've had the reading certificate passed by the State Board of Examiners and State Board of Education. I think that progress of new certificate programs has been slowed down, but it has not been stopped. I think--as far as the learning resources certificate is concerned--I think the Board of Examiners, if you ask me how they feel about it, I want to tell you very candidly, in my certain knowledge, nobody has ever presented a proposal, at least that I've seen. I've heard people talking about proposals, but nobody has submitted a concrete proposal. And I'll tell you why. Because the librarians and the AV people apparently didn't get together for several years on this matter. I've heard them discussing this since 1969. So apparently they've gotten together on something they agree on, And I think very definitely that the Board of Examiners would be very willing to receive a propos[illegible]om some group. Of course, if there are five groups submitting proposals, we're not going to be very sympathetic to that. But if a couple of groups can get together and present some kind of a concrete proposal, and it makes sense educationally to me, I can assure you that I will vote for it. And if there is anything that I can do as a member of the Board of Examiners to make it work, I will be delighted to help.

Dr. Inez Johnson, Introduction of Dr. Barry Thompson

Thank you Dean Truax. Our second speaker, Dr. Barry Thompson, has a diversified background as a professional educator. He has served in the Texas public schools as a classroom science teacher, high school principal, director of secondary education, assistant superintendent and superintendent. Assuming his present position as professor and Head of the Department of Secondary and Higher Education in July of 1975, Dr. Thompson came to East Texas State from Pan American University where he was Head of the Department of Secondary Education for four years. In 1974, he directed the study regarding Texas school facilities for the Governor's Office of Educational Research and Planning. While at Pan American University, Dr. Thompson was instrumental in the design and development of the professional teachers' center. This was a cooperative effort, and is now in its second year of operation giving teachers positive direction in the utilization of instructional resources and innovative teaching strategies. Dr. Thompson has also provided leadership in the implementation of numerous other educational programs including those for minority groups, administrative interns, and para-professionals. Throughout his career, he has been active in professional organizations including the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, TSTA, NEA, Texas Assocation of School Administrators, and Texas Professions of Educational Administration. We are most fortunate to have him with us today to speak on the topic,"How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Priority of Instructional Resources." I'm now pleased to present to you Dr. Barry Thompson.

VII. "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Priority of Instructional Resources?"

Dr. Barry B. Thompson, Head, Department of Secondary and Higher Education, East Texas State University

I thought Mike was just carrying that camera around. I am glad to know that he is using it somewhat. I feel a little bit, standing before you today, like the Cajun cattle-breeder who was sitting one night before his television set drinking a cold RC Cola and he kept hearing this incessant knocking on the front door. The knocking went on and on, and he refused to answer the door believing that he should be watching "Let's Make a Deal."

About that time, a guy kept saying, "Let me in! Let me in! I'm with the federal government." Finally, the Cajun got out of his recliner and walked to the front door to let the guy in.

The man flashed a card and said, "Fellow, you ain't got no sense at all. I'm with the USDA and I can do anything. I can confiscate your property. I can do anything I want to. I can throw you in jail. I'm here to look at your cattle, land and everything to see if you are in compliance with the rules and regulations of the USDA."

The guy said, "Big deal! Tonight I'm watching this TV program and I'm going to watch it two or three more minutes before I quit."

So the inspector left and a little later the old man heard this loud wailing call, "Help me! Oh God, please help me!" The voice just kept calling and calling and finally the old Cajun got out of his chair. He walked out the front door and went to the back where he saw this huge wooden pen; it had a 2400-pound Brahma bull in it and the bull was chasing the inspector.

The Cajun yelled to the inspector, "Show him your card! Show him your card!" (laughter)

I feel a little bit like that today. I don't have a card, but I have been practicing. Dr. Murphy, I will refer to it as "instructional media and technology" or "instructional technology." I have had a heck of a time since coming to ET. I was saying "junior college" and Dr. Tunnell took me under tow and told me it was "community college" and I have learned that. Since I have been here, Dr. Murphy has convinced me that it is not "audiovisual education" anymore; it's "instructional media and technology"--or EMT, or whatever. I intend to pronounce it correctly, Dr. Murphy, if at all possible.

The State Board of Examiners is made up of some rather diverse and interesting people, all the way from college presidents to public school classroom teachers and even to deans of colleges of education. Because of their diversity (they tend to have about twenty-four members now) I can assure you that when any programs are presented, they receive rather long discussion. In fact, Harlan threatened to use the calendar instead of the clock to foreclose some of the discussion that was going on, with some justification I think.

A point of personal privilege--I have known George Lipscomb for a long time, and it is good to see you again, George. I knew George and Harlan both when they had more hair. I used not to be very sympathetic about that, but now that I combed my hairs (both of them) one this way and one that way, I have become more sympathetic, gentlemen.

Instructional resources, in my opinion, today, are really dependent upon two or three considerations. Merely having instructional resources, hardware and software, is not sufficient. It is extremely important, and I think most of my colleagues on the Board of Examiners would agree with me, that we do an increased or an increasingly more productive job of training leaders in the area of instructional media and technology. We need leaders who can see beyond one narrow discipline, who can relate well with all of those who labor in the trenches of the classrooms of all the schools and universities around this state. The other thing I think we have to take into account, as we look at instructional resources, is that the ubiquitous federal dollar is fast decreasing as far as its availability is concerned. Therefore, the competition for the tax dollar means, in my judgment, for the future, that instructional resources must become specifically cost-effective. That is, how do we know that a specific instructional resource will enhance the learning activities for children in the classroom. We must no longer use, again in my judgment, the shotgun treatment that was brought about perhaps by the ready availability of federal money beginning in about 1964. We must pick and choose those programs, those techniques, hardware and software which seem to hold the most promise for enhancing the teacher's performance in the classroom. I would argue today, and it is an old cliche, that that really is where it's at.

Thirdly, in my judgment, there should be a state-wide commitment to research and development centers with regard to instructional resources. Many bits and pieces of hardware are sold across this country basically because industry has found that they are not very beneficial and that they had to develop another market or lose their capital investment. We need, in these research and development centers, to commit money--in my judgment at the state level--to four, five, or six cooperative centers composed of universities, public schools, anyone professionally qualified or interested, to doing some rather way-out things. To see, for example, what human intervention and audio-tutorial presentations do; to see, for example, if we can develop some new measuring devices other than the linear achievement test, measuring devices which we now have and which, in my judgment, can be statistically attacked.

We again, in my judgment, must remember a little bit of what the Carnegie Commission had to say about instructional technology and instructional resources, and I would like to quote that report. First of all, "For technology to be effective, it should be used when the teaching/learning task that is to be performed can be enhanced by technology and would be essential to the course of instruction to which it is applied." The second application we should look at would have to do with the fact that the task to be performed could not be performed as well without the instructional technology available.

Instructional resources then, in my judgment, should be developed in a clinical setting, and this is where I take certain issue with competency-based education. Clinical setting is more than a module. It is more than an audio-tutorial device and learning, in my judgment, can only take place effectively over a period of time where human intervention is found. I would argue that we need to train people who are competent in providing instructional resources to the teachers in the classroom, and even beyond that, who are competent in the area of demonstration teaching where they can actually exhibit the skill and the technique to the classroom teacher, university professor, or whatever the case may be.

The other thing, in my judgment, is that developing instructional potential of educational sub-divisions is absolutely essential today, given our present economic situation, which I don't think will diminish as significantly or move in as positive a direction perhaps in the next decade, and that is, simply put, that instructional resources have to be cooperatively developed, that to remove the teacher in the classroom from the developmental processes will see instructional resource development go the way of the dodo bird, Chem Study, BSCS biology, and I could go on and on and on listing all kinds of other acronyms that you would be familiar with. After twelve years of modern mathematics which supposedly was going to revolutionize the American educational system, we can now say that it is not any worse than what we were doing before. And some who look at basic mathematical skills would have to say they disagree with that.

Instructional resources then, are only as effective as those human beings who apply them. When do you use instructional technology? How do you use instructional technology? When is human intervention important in the educational processes that children are exposed to? I would say that technology must be identified in relationship to the specific objectives of the teacher in the classroom. To hand a teacher a module that is already neatly packaged and nicely prepared, and the module says these are the objectives; these are the supportive goals; these are the interactive matrices--and all that good stuff, to use the jargon correctly--is, in my judgment, not very realistic. Will the teachers use it? Do they know the vocabulary? Do they know the intent of the instructional devices that have been prepared and developed? Can they see improvement in the teaching/learning process because of the application of these devices?

Then I would say that whether we like it or not, we live in two kinds of worlds. One, a world of diminishing dollar availability in the public sector. I think we're going to have to live with that perhaps for the rest of my lifetime, and I intend to live until a hundred and three--at least seven more years. The second thing is that we have to realize that the expert in America today is in disrepute, and this is not the first time; it's kind of cyclic. A Gallup poll recently showed that the American people had a lot less trust in their teachers, a lot less trust in their physicians, and no trust at all in their attorneys. My point is we can develop the most magnificent technology that our considerable professional skills will allow us to develop and if no one will use it, what have we gained?

In conclusion, continuous societal changes require citizens who can learn and then unlearn and then learn again. Instructional resources should be future oriented, and in my judgment, the most significant new discipline in the country today is the area that some people call futuristic and others futurology. I would argue that we can no longer live in the past; we can no longer assume that the old songs and old cliches which have served somewhat moderately well in the past will be sufficient in the future. To deny the functioning, living, breathing interacting classroom teacher access not only to the technology, but to the reasons why, will defeat the purposes, in my judgement, of this conference. I would challenge each of you to realize that instructional technology is instructional technology is instructional technology until human intervention takes place and until some human mind develops and focuses a program that helps children learn much more adequately than they seem to be learning today according to linear achievement tests, and I have very little confidence in linear achievement tests. Thank you.

Dr. Lilley

Well, I certainly want to thank both of our luncheon speakers again for giving us two more points of view.

We are coming along fine on our schedule. As you note, we are pushing you right along today. Our next program will be presented by Mr. George Lipscomb at 2 p.m. in the American Ballroom.

Dr. Loyd Guidry introducing Mr. George Lipscomb

Dr. Williams has just mentioned to me that any of you who would be interested in taking a tour of the facilities we have here may want to meet with him at the front of the auditorium after our last speaker this afternoon where Earle will be conducting a tour.

In talking with Mr. Lipscomb awhile ago, I found that he and I have philosophies that are just about the same. In the first place, I think that the shortest introduction is probably the best one, but I did go a bit further than he suggested. Mr. Lipscomb recommended that I just say, "Well, there he is!" I did go a little further than that though, and with some digging, I found out a few interesting facts about him. Mr. Lipscomb was raised in Quitman, Texas, which is over in Wood County, not too far from here. He actually took his first degree from East Texas. . .what was ET called then? (laughter) I hope it wasn't East Texas Normal. Was Mayo still here? (laughter)

All together, Mr. Lipscomb has been in public education thirty-six years in the state of Texas and has been both a classroom teacher and an administrator. He is now on the state level where he has been with the Texas Education Agency for nine years. He is presently Director of Instructional Resources at the Texas Education Agency. Also, he has recently directed the Texas Study of Instructional Resources which was probably the largest grass-roots study of education ever conducted in the state of Texas. Another little pearl that he shared with me with which I will close was, "They won't remember the introduction nearly as much as what I've got to say, if it's good." Mr. George Lipscomb.

VIII. "Public School Instructional Resources System and State Priority"

Mr. George Lipscomb, Director, Division of Instructional Resources, Texas Education Agency

You know, I really thought it was Mayo College though. Wasn't it, back about that time? Well, over the last three years, it's been my pleasure to go across the state of Texas assimilating information about the Instructional Resources System, interpreting its concepts. I see many of you--or some of you--here that I've talked with before and who have been involved in those groups. We've met with something in excess of 15,000 people in the last three years, and Jo Ann, I'm not going to give you the same speech. I did write a new one just for this, and I think I'm going to give it, regardless.

Well, the message, I think, is still the same. We, you and I, are all working toward the time in our lives when we will see a tightly-knit organization of school learning resources programs functioning to provide teachers and students the best services and resources that our society can afford. I think that by applying what we know about management systems, by using the technology that we have, by uniting in common projects to improve services, we can accelerate the development of a delivery system second to none in the field of education.

Let me speak for a minute or two about what I mean by a delivery system. I'm not talking about a logistical way or system to supply books and films. I use a broad definition of delivery to cover all aspects of instructional resources and related services. Delivery covers the creation, the design, the evaluation and the use of instructional materials. I mean also the management of their processes, storage and circulation. Last but not least certainly would be an emphasis on utilization. Everyone here, I think, will give credence to the old saw that even the best materials can do a lousy job in the hands of a wrong teacher. I'm saying that our job--those of us in instructional resources--our job is not finished until we've done all that we can to insure that the materials created, bought, processed and circulated are used as well as they can be.

Now, back to the instructional resources system. After three years or so of talking about an instructional resources system and three years, before that, of studying the system and the resources within the system, I would certainly think that the basic premise would be known and grasped by all, but this isn't true. It's so hard to change the minds of many. I know that there is a lot of competition among the continual stream of "renew this" and "renew that." There is special education, career education, crime and drug education, bilingual/multi-cultural education, and we can go on and on with this list. What caused me to go through this list? All of this is competing for dollars and the attention of people. I'm convinced that we're involved in something that can support and serve all of these different departments and divisions and interest groups. That is the Instructional Resources System of the State of Texas.

Information management to me is much larger than computer banks or raw data or tables of statistics or the collection and dissemination of the same. I think information services are what all of us in instructional resources are about. As I said, the packaging, the distribution and the use of information is certainly our business. All instructional programs need resources. All instructional programs must have information for teachers and students to learn and to experience. Books, films, television are all an extension of the human mind as a way to reach other humans. We don't have any such tools for dogs and horses and other animals. Media are for the human. They're human to human, and I believe the part that we play in the delivery of media is a vital part of the educational business. As we look around at our society, at our schools, at our children and even at ourselves, I think that you will agree that the whole media game is as important in the education of our children and ourselves as teachers, as important as buildings, as important as good management. After all, won't good tools make a teacher better? And where does a good teacher get the information that keeps her or him up-to-date and progressing in the instructional arena? It's usually via media. Yes, I think we play a great and important role in education and I think that role is growing daily. It's time, in fact, it's really past time, to give the management and delivery of instructional materials some serious consideration. And I don't mean more studies and guidelines and wishing. It's time to bring some attention to ourselves and to what we want to do. The instructional resources system is a part of what we want to do and that is to integrate all instructional resources management under one umbrella, to make processes and programs compatible and to most assuredly include all media-related services in a comprehensive support system for instructional excellence.

Let me state briefly some assumptions about Texas public schools' present status concerning instructional resources programs. I developed most of these assumptions after having visited across the state. My first assumption is that instructional resources are often thought of as frills rather than as essential elements in the instructional process. This is true in spite of evidence to the contrary. For example, the textbook is probably the single most used and influential tool in public instruction. It has been for years. Yet we have those who say, "Let's do away with the textbooks," or "Let's cut back on their use." And yet we are able to provide, per student, books at the rate of about $6.00 per text. And its getting more and more difficult to maintain that level.

Another assumption is that some teachers don't have the skills for using resources effectively. Some teachers have had too many poor examples of "how to effectively use media." So what did they learn?--how to lecture, how to assign studies. Where is all this management of the classroom stuff in practice? I find some very good examples of this as we go across the state. However, we find those good examples are still in the minority.

My third assumption is that students don't have the variety and the kinds of materials for learning which we could provide through a planned, integrated instructional system. It's apparent that some schools have what many poor districts would consider an abundance of materials, equipment and service personnel. And even some so-called poor districts have an abundance of materials, equipment and personnel due to federal monies. There is not an equal opportunity for students when it comes to equal access to quality and variety of instructional resources.

My fourth assumption is that schools do not have an integrated resources program which is built on a cooperatively-based school philosophy. In fact, many schools do not have a basic philosophy that they can readily identify, and too many certainly don't have an instructional resources program that is orderly, conceptually consistant, or operated within a common school philosophy. I think in some ways, this is the most crucial, basic weakness of our instructional resources program right now. That's why, as I speak to different groups, I keep coming back to the concept of an instructional resources system at the local level, because it's at the local level that things must begin to be put in order. That's where the services and functions of a delivery system must develop, and it all starts with the philosophy of what kind of an instructional program, what learner outcomes and what methodologies will be wanted.

Assumption number five is that the school resources personnel have a limited perception of skills to completely fulfill their roles and functions in a comprehensive instructional resources program. I'm saying that we all need to think big and to use the available technology and systems now in existence. I think this is going to take a lot of cooperation, compromise and readjustment. Existing resources programs are not concerned with the total school program. I think here I only need to remind you of the diversity of special interests, the lack of basic philosophies and the lack of support necessary to develop and maintain good programs.

And now I think of my next assumption. That is of students and staffs in school who are, as a rule, not readily involved in their learning resources program. They aren't involved in its planning, in its evaluation, and too often they aren't aware of the real services that could be theirs.

I realize that these assumptions are negative. I'm not a pessimist. I'm not a defeatist. I'm basically an optimist, and I'm especially optimistic when it comes to the benefits that can be achieved by the instructional resources system. In order for us to achieve educational goals and instructional objectives, we must have a plan. I think we can work together to solve our problems. I think the instructional resources system design is the pattern that we need.

The school instructional resources program is an instructional service. It's also a management system. It must be shaped by the school's philosophy, the school's learning objectives, the teacher's needs and skills and the students' needs and characteristics. Those who must interact in the process of providing a good instrucitonal program are teachers, students, resources specialists, parents and school administrators. We must include in the concept of this learning resources center, the libraries, the auditoriums, the classrooms, the processing and production labs, the projection booths, the television studios, the photography labs, the cable television facilities, the public-address systems; and you could go on and on. We must strive to improve our self-concept and our clients' concepts. We must become more precise in our selection and evaluation of materials. We must broaden our capability for in-service and continuous-utilization training.

I think the place to start, once the broad concept has been accepted, is in more systematic planning, re-planning and instructional-resources management. We must take every opportunity to advertise our potential as well as our accomplishments. We need basic support for instructional resources, programs and personnel. We must help others to understand these needs and to seek their support. It's people like you who must begin to seek that support vigorously, and at every opportunity, while at the same time work to implement the best local-level instructional resources program that we know.

Now, when we can answer those assumptions that I stated in a positive manner, at that point in time, we will have implemented the basic Instructional Resources System of Texas; and we will have spent the dollar in a more efficient and effective way, thus providing a better educational opportunity for our boys and girls. We are now ready for a film of the overall concept of this Instructional Resources System. (film showing)

To give you an idea about the size of the program that we're talking about, when we started the study in 1971, we asked our business office to go back and tell us the amount of money that was spent the preceding year on instructional resources in Texas, out of state and federal funds alone. For 1970, we exceeded 93 million dollars. Last year our business office gave us an up-date of that and in the fiscal year of 1974, we spent in excess of 180 million dollars. So without the new monies that the film talked about, we still have a big job to coordinate the selection, purchase, delivery, evaluation and utilization of all instructional materials.

I'm sure most of you are familiar with the State Board priorities. I believe part of my subject was to speak on the priority area of instructional resources. I think most of you have read this. If not, you have copies available. The State Board of Education simply believes that all children in the state public schools should have timely access to appropriate instructional resources, carefully chosen to enhance the activities for desired outcomes. Then we have the long-range, multi-year objectives that have been referred to several times in other presentations here today. I would simply refer you to this for those long-range, multi-year objectives. One other thing, we did produce a year ago last August "The Guidelines for Professional Development." These guidelines were sent to all colleges and universities. They were sent to all public school superintendents. They are available for you if you have not received a copy. We did conduct, last year, a study that had to do with telecommunications in the state that was a part of the technology portion of this. Out of that, came certain recommendations to the State Board. That report is presently being analyzed and a report will be forthcoming to the committee of the Board, and possibly to the Board in the very near future.

We'd like to take this opportunity to say thank you for permitting us to come and present the Instructional Resources System of Texas. Thank you very much.

Dr. Donald Coker introducing Dr. Harlan Ford

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the afternoon session on School Certification Programs that Affect School Media Programs. We feel we're very fortunate to have with us today a gentleman who has a well-established reputation for quality education in the state. Dr. Ford, I'm sure, is known by each of you. He has distinguished himself as a teacher-administrator, and for the past eight years, he has been involved in work with the Texas Education Agency. But those of us who have known Dr. Ford over a period of time feel he is best known for the reputation he has established as one of the most articulate spokesmen for quality education in the state of Texas. It is therefore a pleasure to present to you Dr. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development, Texas Education Agency. --Dr. Ford.

IX. "School Certification Programs That Affect School Media Programs"

Dr. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development, Texas Education Agency

Thank you very much, Dr. Coker. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I know that each of you has had a very, very busy day. I've been sitting, just as you have, and I know that there is a limit to how much one can endure. Therefore, I shall try to be as brief, as succinct as I possibly can this afternoon; but I'm not going to shortchange myself with a few of my biases and notions that I feel that I simply must share with you. That being the result, I hope I won't detain you too long. For those who found it necessary to avail themselves of the use of their coats and adjourn for points elsewhere, I'm sorry that they're going to miss this. (laughter) I think perhaps, however, that all of us assembled here today are indeed indicative, not only of a high interest, but of a strong commitment as a group of professional personnel trying to reach out, trying to make a tremendous difference in the quality of education for what it may become.

I truly feel that it is a privilege and a pleasure to be here with you, to have enjoyed the discussion and dialogue that has transpired thus far; I look forward to the questions that I'm sure will be elicited by and from the group as we close here this afternoon. May I say to each of you that the kinds of input and suggestions and/or questions that you proffer will indeed be important to those of us who are charged with the responsibility in policy-leadership development for Texas education. Therefore, I would strongly encourage you: Don't be inhibited. Say what you feel. Say what you think. Express your concerns. While we may not know the answers to many of the questions, I think it is important that we try to get them before us.

This afternoon I was asked to address really a combination of things for you: the whole arena of certification relative to teacher preparation for the learning resources personnel, the arena of impact of certification of personnel upon this specialized area, and quite realistically, to address some of the emerging issues that relate to this kind of concern and/or development. It's very difficult to know where to begin. I hope I will be astute enough to know when to stop. However, in the past when I served as a university professor, my students always "enjoyed" my classes immensely because they never knew when they were going to terminate, and as a result, when they did, they were ever so grateful. Many times we have gone into the wee hours of the morning. Don't get panicky. I'm not going to do that to you this afternoon.

By way of background, may I state two or three different considerations here that, in part, have been alluded to this afternoon by some of the other speakers; but I say them by reason of re-addressing a fundamental background perspective of the question before us. First, the State Board of Education authorized a study, back in October of 1970, of the total instructional resources system, and in September, 1974, approved the design for an instructional resources system based upon that 1970 study. Mr. Lipscomb has described that to you. That design has found its way to becoming a priority for the State Board of Education in developing designs for the '80's. Within the design that was approved by the State Board of Education, is the concept of professional development of the learning resources specialist which Mr. Lipscomb addressed very briefly. This design combines the competencies formerly held chiefly by those who hold a librarian certificate together with the competencies that should be held by the media specialist. As a result, the learning resources center program concept was reaffirmed by the State Board.

Since 1955, teacher education standards have included requirements for the librarian's certificate. The program has called for eighteen semester hours of work in librarianship, including three hours of school library practice, in addition to a basic teaching certificate. That certificate has served quite well; it has been functional indeed. However, that certificate did not recognize the concept of the learning resources center and the learning resources specialist. Clearly, today a library is conceived in a comprehensive frame of reference including the function of the instructional resources center to provide materials in a variety of formats, both print and non-print, and to give attention to technology that can be used within educational processes.

Since 1967, the Division of Teacher Education within the Texas Education Agency has maintained contact with both the Texas Association for Educational Technology and the Texas Council on Library Education in an effort to formalize a preparation program for the learning resources specialist. That program realistically should prepare a practicing professional with the necessary knowledge, skills, background and competencies that would be necessary to function at a campus level as a learning resources specialist. The philosophical commitment to this position was promulgated in the work of the 1969 study commission which Dr. Thompson alluded to at lunch today, resulting in the '72 standards for teacher education. Then in 1974, the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education did, in fact, agree in principle with the idea of a learning resources specialist. A joint committee representing the Texas Council on Library Education and the Texas Association for Educational Technology began work on the specifics to be included in the preparation program. A tentative proposal consisting of some thirty-six hours of work was developed and disseminated through Media Matters and Educational Resources and Techniques and was discussed at professional meetings at the state level of the Texas Association for Educational Technology, Texas Association of School Librarians, Texas

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Texas Council on Library Education. As was told you today at lunch, there has not, in the past, been a single program that has represented unanimity of effort, solidarity of support and concerted understanding on the part of the two groups that has been brought forward to the Board of Examiners at this particular point. The concept being presented at the first outset, when presented to the Board, represented a diverse and almost dichotomous position. The second time, they came back after some intervening dialogue of saying, "Look folks, let's get our heads together on this. If we can agree, OK; if we can't agree, then let's agree to disagree." But with the intervening discussion, the second round came back, and there was agreement between the groups as to what the learning resources specialist might look like, but in a tentative format to the extent that the program was not yet presented. Therefore, it has been in a long-developing posture. It has been indicative, I think, of the separate perceptual viewpoints and certainly the compromising positions of many of us in this room, and many not present here today, in the give and take that is so essential and that I shall speak to momentarily.

The proposed preparation program clearly recognized that the needs of the school demanded a new type of professional to staff a learning resources center. A school of today has heavy involvement with technology--the increasing use of instructional television, films, filmstrips, filmloops, cassettes, etcetra, etcetra. Other materials and strategies have brought about the realization that learning occurs in different settings and as the result of a variety of different stimuli. That is not to say, however, that educational methodology should minimize the importance of printed materials, in reading particularly, in a day when reading achievement at all levels of the educational spectrum is in dire need of improvement.

The Joint Committee expressed the position that it is possible to prepare an individual in a broad context to serve as a learning resources specialist at the campus level. What then should be the competencies expected of such a professional? After more than a year of research and study, the Joint Committee expressed the feeling that the following elements should be included in such a program, and may I take just a second to identify those for you: a practicum, a minimum of the one hundred clock hours that would be equal to our accounting system of three semester hours of credit; a specialization area of eighteen semester hours including basic competencies in collections development, collections processing, instructional design and development, learning resources center organization and administration, local production of instructional materials, materials for children including multi-cultural/ multi-ethnic materials and utilization practices, reference and bibliography;--and you immediately say, "My Lord! How can I do all of that in eighteen semester hours?" That is a good question--a resource area of six semester hours including but not limited to the following: instructional design, theory, principles, methods, communication, instructional television, computer assisted instruction, etcetra, advanced local production, systems design, interpretation and applied research, statistics, information networks, program planning and development, management, automation, human relations, client groups and information needs; cognate courses approved by the separate institutions based upon the individual background of the student himself; a professional education area of six semester hours requiring curriculum development and design and a choice of three semester hours from the following: psychology, learning theory, educational systems, organization of education, education in a society including multi-cultural/multi-ethnic elements.

The Joint Committee felt that the requirements that I have enumerated should allow institutions of higher education the flexibility necessary for experimentation and innovation, and at the same time, provide the concepts needed for the implementation of programs and services of the learning resources center. The requirements are realistically based upon the functions that the learning resources specialist is expected to perform. Even though preparation program elements have been identified, the institutions of higher education will have to determine the specific curriculum and the instructional program in which the competencies would be developed. Therefore, it would appear that the state now is on the threshold of a new era of services in the area of instructional resources. Hopefully, the new preparation program for the learning resources specialist can be adopted and can be implemented in the immediate future.

At that, I must turn now to some of the grim realities that exist, because while all of this in an historical setting has, in fact, transpired, there are a number of other forces which have been at work and a number of other elements which make a significant difference. With that, let me try to identify some of the emerging and developing issues that impact the directions that we take and the next turns down the road.

First of all, let's establish a backdrop before which the American educational setting and more particularly Texas now presents itself. A state-wide economic thrust, with executive leadership attests to the fact that 49.4 percent of total state expenditure is dedicated to education, with a further qualification that we are spending too much and getting too little. Now whether we agree, disagree, believe or disbelieve, one of the grim realities that is out there is the question of fiscal credibility as to whether education can and shall survive in its present context and format. And here again at the risk of sounding offensive--now I'm talking to myself--there are two basic groups that are part and parcel of this: "those folks in higher education who are doing too little and being paid too much and the bureaucratic state leadership that provides unimaginative direction." Now, when we take a look at cost considerations that are built in here, we lay that against the backdrop that I have just described, and we've got a credibility question that we must cope with.

Starting back with the Blue Ribbon Committee for public education, created during the governance of Mr. John Connally, the total study for public education resulted in "Goals for Public Education." This was a broad-based, grass-roots consideration saying what education should be like. It was picked up and adopted by the State Board of Education and has been re-examined, re-affirmed and distributed across the state; yet, at a public consumption level, still represents a limit in how many folks really know what the goals for public education in this state would be. Now I'm not going to pull a test on you, but privately, silently reflect on it. How many have really examined this? Yet we have printed and distributed in excess of a quarter of a million copies of those goals, virtually moving to the supermarket variety of newsprint distribution of information in an effort to try to convince the public-at-large that there is something that we must make our minds up about the quality and what we want education in this state to become. That finds its expression in the goals statement very simply in three separate sections: (1) in terms of student development, and that I shall speak to in a moment, (2) in terms of organizational efficiency and

(3) in terms of accountability.

Now, the third developing picture or issue is this. Eleven-twenty-six, when developed as the new finance bill for our state, enacted this past September for the first time as the Foundation School Program, has two very basic change considerations in it. Heretofore, our accounting system for classroom teacher units had a certain magic about assigning this teacher to x number of students for x function; it now says, taking the global average, you get so many personnel units. Therefore, with the eligible personnel units available to you, Mr. Superintendent, you make the decision as to how you're going to plan and style the educational program within your district. Therefore, the security and the comfort of pre-identified categories for professional personnel utilization could and may become a totally different picture. Consider it well if you would. The second part of Eleven-twenty-six, that has an impact yet to be realized, is the provisional statement which says beginning September, 1977, each district, in order to be eligible for the receipt of Foundation School Program Funds, shall be an accredited school. Heretofore, ladies and gentlemen, the accreditation process was voluntary. It now becomes mandatory. The wisdom, as we designed it, defines what accreditation standards would be, when laid against a local self-study development, when laid against peer evaluation, and a determination for eligibility of funds-flow, puts all of us into a different arena of thought.

Number four in this process--and I'm not rabbit chasing--I hope you can trail some of the things that I'm trying to show you here to go with this process. We are about the task of trying to design and to develop what we call Planning-Budgeting-Evaluation Systems at the local district level. Now, you heard data presented to you this morning about limitations experienced at a local-district setting to plan capably, to cope with these kinds of questions. Therefore, the basic premise under which we are now styling and operating is to say that if we build in the capability at a local district level to study, to plan a program and to build all of those elements at a local district capacity capability, then we think in terms of the quality of it. Now, where do we begin? Consistent with the total instructional resources concept, first, with a local needs determination of what is required at a local level, and second, with a commitment stance of what you're willing to put up in order to accomplish what you said you needed, and then third, to expose it to the light of day through some type of an evaluative process. To produce those data, both qualitative and quantitative, which would help to represent the success of our efforts, now built into the credibility stance, then I must go back to point number two in which I have laid out Goals for Public Education, Subset A, Student Development. More and more, the popular climate that appears to be developing is what I would call a trichotomy of perceptual disparity. Now, let me demonstrate. We have three basic entities within the educational structure in our state today. We, the professional community, who talk to ourselves, whose credibility, as Dr. Thompson told you today at lunch, is quasi, and in many quarters questioned--and I just have to say his statement, from my vantage point is accurate--but we, the professional, in talking to ourselves, naively, smugly, self-righteously and even piously, put a smile on our face and say, "Look what a great job we're doing!" And the second part of that trichotomy, the public-at-large, the taxpaying public, the citizenry, they look at us and they get a scowl on their faces and they say, "You're doing what?" And then the third element, the student group, to whom we are responsible for delivering a quality educational program, with a new-found freedom, a voice of self expression and an element of genuine dissidence, whether it be at the elementary, secondary, junior college, university, adult continuing level in today's modern setting, in a not-too-nice way, he looks at us with that question and he says, "Like hell you are!" Now, with that kind of a framework then with the trichotomy that does exist here, I think we must find a way to put all of those thinkings together so that we can approach a common concern and an issue.

The fifth element is what I would call extending the educational service within the learning resources arena to the broader community, and may I suggest to you two or three things in that particular regard. Mr. Lipscomb identified to you the phenomenal cost for different materials that have been expended in this state for different periods. That, in anyone's fiscal accounting, is not to be misinterpreted as peanuts. That's a pretty good chunk of the dollar This past year our expenditure for textbook purchases, with all of the escalating costs, was just a few dollars more than thirty-eight million. Now then, the questions I have to consistently and constantly ask are, "How many of those are being used and what is the quality of that which is out there?" But then the parent at large over here says, "Wait a minute! We want a voice in what is said here too." Therefore, the process includes them. Now, here is a question that we haven't answered. We've taken care of the printed materials acquisitions, selection of state-purchased materials; but when you get into the arena of the media element, whether it be films, filmstrips, recordings, or what have you, what has been our process for involving the public, parents, community-at-large group? We haven't! As a consequence, they're beginning to raise some pretty serious questions. They want to be a part of that understanding, that selection, that right to investigate, that right to question whether those materials are desirable. I submit to you that within the learning resources center, as a concept, as a program, as a site, regardless of the definition that we apply to it, we must find some vehicle for greater, broader community service interaction in order to preclude intervention by a group that now is excluded.

My sixth consideration refers to the point addressed a moment ago and that is the credibility that we enjoy whether we have any or not. I think we do, and I would say without equivocation that Texas education, by documentation, is in better shape today than it has ever been at any previous era in recorded state history. But that's not good enough, just to say it. We have to verify it, and as a result of verification, we enter the arena then of accountability. Now, like that word or dislike it, it's with us and it's real. Accountability includes all of the umbrella sub-elements of assessing, evaluating, ascertaining, verifying or whatever word you want to use; but as we begin to get into any accountability framework, we begin to ask the hard questions: what? for whom? how much? how far? and why? And the moment you begin to provide answers, you begin to produce an arena of raising concern. Now you're sitting there thinking, "Why in the world is he telling me this, simply to arrive at one point?" I have shown you the historical backdrop of the learning resources specialist certification program and where we can move to the future. We must be super cautious however, in my judgment, not to over-state our case and build an accountability expectation that cannot, in fact, be measured up to.

Finally, it would appear that the state is now on the threshold of being ready for a new service area in instructional resources, and hopefully, that we can begin a preparation program.

How soon can we do this? There is one seventh current condition that each of us need to be totally cognizant of. The Sixty-Fourth State Legislature passed a bill known as Senate Bill Forty-one, and that particular bill is commonly identified as the Texas Registry Act. The elements of that bill are these: any rule, policy, regulation, guideline with general applicability to the public schools and/or college communities across the state must in fact be published in the Texas Register via the Secretary of State's office thirty days prior to when notice of intent to adopt is given. During that thirty-day period, any group of twenty-five individuals or any group with twenty-five individuals or more, in its membership, desiring to lodge a question, protest or petition in oppostion to any elements thereof of the proposed rules, may so file, indicate and must be granted a hearing for the petitions to be received and a record made, after which those concerns are considered with a re-filing of any changes within twenty days,after which, if all things are equal, you carry it forward to the State Board of Education for its acceptance for it then to become effective twenty days thereafter the date it has been adopted. Now then, I haven't complicated life enough yet, so let me get through. The Board of Examiners for Teacher Education is a group to whom and on whom we depend. We send no programs in teacher preparation or professional preparation to the State Board of Education unless it's been through the Board of Examiners with their recommendations. That group meets four times a year. Now, let me demonstrate by a cycle. Let's assume that the learning resources specialist certificate program was presented at the January 26-28 meeting of the Board of Examiners. Before it can actually be filed in *The Register*, it must go forward, not to the March meeting, because I don't have enough time to get it there, but to the April meeting of the State Board of Education with an intent to adopt. Thirty days thereafter, moving it down to May, if we have no disparity amongst the groups necessitating hearing; the Board could adopt it in May to be effective twenty days thereafter, which would be roughly May 30. Now, in the eventthat there should be some discrepancies and some differing viewpoints, then the schedule is prolonged. Now I am taking a little bit longer than I normally would take on that for us to have a clear-cut understanding of the total "due process" effort and the reflection of appeals and concerns that go into a rules-changing kind of effort, because I think it's important for all of us to know and to recognize what is involved. I think that we also must recognize that the nature of our profession, as we cope with the concern of trying to identify and establish professional support and credibility, necessitates and behooves a practice on the part of all of us to be a whole lot more loving than so quick to be hitting; that's difficult for us to do, and I know that, because of the nature of human nature, our involvement and our concern in things. But, ladies and gentlemen, I can assure you that from my vantage point, the time is ripe in education for us as a group of folk to concern ourselves about program accountability with an agreed-to understanding of what we really think education is supposed to produce; and if we can get there, we can move the time-orderly process a lot faster. In the overall effort of institutions of higher education--and I've worked with them a number of years in this state, used to be a part of them, and so forth and so on, so I have a variety of experience backgrounds from which to speak--I know of no state that enjoys the cooperation, the support and the honest-to-goodness imagination that exists at the higher educational setting as does this state. But I also know of no state where we have encouraged, through design and effort to speak your mind and get it out so we can deal with it. And now, by reason of our being in that posture, many of these other peripheral but very real issues are out there. In my judgment, this issue comes at at time when we have the best of thought, the most caring expression, and more importantly, the quality of "action." I believe that through the learning resources proposed certificate area, we can, in fact, create a service to our youth, our teachers, our professionals and that we have the real opportunity to educate the community-at-large with a service that can be understood and that we can do it in a highly cost-effective fashion. But we can't do it by ourselves as an individual unit; it requires the expertise of us all working toward a common purpose. Thank you very much.

X. Group Feedback and Summary

Dr. Bruce Ledford, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University

Dr. Mary Wheeler, Associate Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University

Dr. Ledford

I have, along with Dr. Mary Wheeler, the unenviable task of summarizing, and in general, recapitulating the day's events. I call this task unenviable because I think it's analagous to summarizing the Encyclopaedia Britannica for cognitive content and the Holv Bible for affective aspects. Not only that, I have to do it within five minutes or less, so I have an unenviable task. To say the least, I feel, as most of you do, that this conference has the potential of rivaling the Bible and the Encyclopaedia Britannica on our scale, compared to their scale. I'm sure you've been impressed with the quality of the speakers that we've had today and especially of what they've had to say. I would like to add my commendations to Dr. Lilley and to Dr. Murphy for their planning and facilitating the conference.

At the outset of the conference, we were presented with a list of questions that we wished to answer during the conference. At this time, I would like to address myself to four of these questions and the relevant comments made by Mickey Boyvey. Specifically, if you have those questions before you, they are the first four on the handout that you received.

Dr. Boyvey spoke to these questions in the presentation entitled, "A Systems Approach Applied to Learning Resources Development." She began by discussing the question, "Why new guidelines?" She then presented a list of six reasons which include that ESEA Title II requires us to take an annual view of state guidelines, also to keep pace with the changes that are ever present, to develop a deeper understanding of concept of roles and staff, recognize roles the LRC plays within the district, recognize the relationship among learning resource programs at all levels, and sixth be concerned for broader conceptualization of LRC programs. A slide/sound presentation described a day in the life of an LRC director. In this presentation, a non-traditional, instructional program was described. In the description, it was obvious without the leadership of the guidelines, the program likely would not be possible. A systematic approach to the design and implementation of the program, made possible by the guidelines and standards, the need for a certified learning resources specialist, the need for a planning program system to be designed and implemented by the learning resources specialist and teachers, and the necessity of support of the school administrator were detailed. A system involving students, teachers, administrators and the learning resources specialist was described. Again, it was obvious that, in the case of most systems, if one of the sub-systems is absent, the entire system will probably die. I feel that one of the most significant statements made by Mickey was, and I quote from her presentation, "Administrators must be convinced that the assumptions made about teaching and learning that are supported by the learning resources program are simply better than those in common practice." How can we convince them? I personally make this appeal. Provide hard facts and hard data, research, rationales, success stories ad infinitum to administrators. We can provide a degree of accountability demanded by concerned publics.

I think this goes hand in hand with what Dean Truax said today at our luncheon. Specifically, that no one has submitted a concrete proposal for certification of learning resources specialists. I might add that the current status of the certificate proposal is in the final writing stages preparatory to presentation to the State Board of Examiners, and of course, Dr. Ford spoke of that.

Barry Thompson pointed to the inertness of hardware and software. Merely having hardware and software is not sufficient. Also of concern, federal dollars are leaving. We must be "cost-effective" conscious. Also, we should have a state-wide commitment to research and development of hardware and software. Of major importance, technology must be identified to the specific objectives of the teacher, not to mass-produced programs.

George Lipscomb presented TEA's priority for learning resources programs. Specifically, the State Board of Education believes that all children in the Texas public schools should have timely access to appropriate instructional resources, carefully chosen to enhance the achievement of desired outcomes. By 1980, systems and procedures for the provision of instructional resources to school district programs will be operational. Thank you.

Dr. Wheeler

Perhaps one of the ways of demonstrating what guidelines can do for you is that Bruce and I were allowed to create or ignore guidelines so far as our summarization was concerned. So, with the lack of guidelines, we've both done it our own ways. Bruce has approached this report from one standpoint, I from another. In my comments, I will not identify the sources of the ideas; rather, I have tried to combine them somewhat, and I may do nothing in the world but confuse you and make you wonder where in the world it was that you heard it.

We have been reminded that our national standards and guidelines, and our state ones as well, have many points in common and many concerns in common, that they are all concerned with the "stuff" which we use and which we produce, the personnel who are concerned vitally and essentially in media, curriculum specialists who are providing us "fodder," we might say, and the teachers themselves then who are our avenues of delivery, in a way. They are all concerned with funding, whether it is federal, whether it is local, whether, as someone suggested, we might find a philanthropist; and it seems that they are vanishing even faster than the federal dollar. But no matter where the source of funding, we still are going to have to account for what we do with those things entrusted to us. We, at all levels of guidelines, are concerned with materials, and when we think of materials, we think of content; we think of collections of various kinds, print collections, non-print collections, the resources of varied descriptions and the design of those things and how we create them and for what purposes. And again, all guidelines are concerned with facilities and operations, the kinds of things we have and then what we do with them and how well we use them.

Some of the effects that standards and guidelines have had for us have been that among these, that of the federal funding has made possible acquisition of much of the software and hardware which our schools are using today. The funds have also given an impetus to the central learning resources center and a change in the physical appearance of our schools in that we have things housed together that used to be far apart, that we tend to group certain things in satellite locations and put them where they are used. They've also had an effect upon staffing; our titles have changed. We tend to go through cycles; organizations are renamed; they name each other; they rename themselves. We tend to take on a more descriptive title for a certain function, and sometimes we feel like we don't know who we are ourselves. We have directors and specialists, and we have centers, and we have collections, and we have many things such as that. We were reminded by Zella Lewis that no matter what title we eventually come down to, we may be assured that we also will have initials, and I don't know whether we should hope that they spell something or not. We do need more coordination, and we have begun to show more, perhaps, among campuses.

Another effect simply has been the very visible effect of architecture. Our schools are designed differently. We've been told that we design our schools and shape them and that, from then on, they shape us. Well, perhaps that is the point where programs shape schools. We've had a change in the teaching/learning process. We have seen the open concept, the emphasis on individualized study, and the drive toward the creation of independent lifetime learners using all resources which are available.

Another effect has been that of the services and the users and the utilizaton. The pattern is that the function, the use of any kind of resource, must be a satisfying experience if we expect it to become a permanent experience. We have special applications. We've extended services to the very youngest all up through adult education, continuing education, the special learners who need particular kinds of collections and treatments. And teachers, as they become accustomed to these kinds of application, then desire more and more in the way of media.

Another effect has been that of the preparation of staff, the emphasis upon competencies, the media orientation which we have seen develop. However, one problem which has been noted is in teacher preparation. We do not have a requirement for competency in media. This has been something that has been left to individual interpretation, and this shortcoming is beginning to make it's weight felt. Without a teacher who knows something about the utilization of media, it is very difficult for a specialist to work with that teacher. A specialist who does not know something about the curriculum cannot really give full service to the teacher. Administrators need to understand the potential of media utilization and what it can do and the kinds of things that it can add to an educational program. We've also mentioned that the administrator needs to understand that many of us don't know enough about his funding problems and his administrative problems, and so we need to build a two-way street there.

In order to live up to some of the words that we've heard today about accountability and such, perhaps we need to create a pattern of record keeping, know what we have done, when it worked, how it worked, whether the results were actually something that we could be proud of, something that has meant real development in a child. We also talked a little bit about what we can expect from media centers, from our district center and what it should provide. We said that the school itself should have some kind of specialist with leadership and management roles, that the district then may have a district coordinator and that the regional service centers serve us in areas which single school districts cannot take care of by themselves. And at the state level, we should expect the determination of policies and the legislative recommendations.

I think we were all interested in one set of remarks about what a media specialist's job really is. It is difficult for him to determine quantity and quality demanded if he doesn't even know what the job is. We need to begin with the specification of goals for the learners so that then the program can be developed to achieve those specifications, and here again, the emphasis is on the media specialist's, the resources specialist's having a thorough acquaintance with curriculum and development of it, with design of instruction and being well enough aware of his own locality's curriculum that he can instantly sense the value of new materials to which he is exposed and also not only sense their value, but channel them into the right location and to the right teacher.

I think there have been some words that we have heard in nearly all of the presentations today. Perhaps they've formed somewhat the keywords or keynotes of today's experiences. I think I would choose these words: "access" which we have heard over and over again. Unless the proper people have correct access to resources of all kinds, then the resources are actually wasted, that we should "monitor" our actions, our expectations and our achievements at all times. Evaluate them in a continuing process, that all our concerns should be "learner-oriented," because after all, that's the business we're in, that our program should be "flexible," that we should not become "rigid," that we should be ready to "change," to take advantage of things as they come along, that they should be "open-ended," so that we never close the door on ourselves and say this is as far as we're going; this must be the final accomplishment because we'll never live to see that, and that we should, again, come back down to "accountability." This is expected of us; we expect it of other people, and we should certainly not intend to do less for them than we want them to do for us. And I suppose one word that hasn't been said a great deal but which would apply to all of the above is that they have a real momentary significance in that they're all important to us right "now."

Appendix. A

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Center for Educational Media and Technology
Conference on Learning Resources
December 15, 1975
Program

Registration and Coffee 9:00-9:30 Founder's Lounge

Introductions and Welcome 9:30-9:50 American Ballroom
Beatrice Murphy, Director, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University
Richard C. Meyer, Vice President for Academic Affairs, East Texas State University
F. H. McDowell, President, East Texas State University

Overview of the Conference 9:50-10:00 American Ballroom
Dorothy B. Lilley, Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University

Media Programs: District and School 10:00-10:20 American Ballroom
Earle Williams, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University
Lou Correll, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University

Guidelines for the Development of Campus Learning Resources Centers 10:20-11:05 Bluebonnet/Pecan/Friendship
Mary Boyvey, Program Director, Division of Instructional Resources, Texas Education Agency. Introduction--Dorothy B. Lilley

"The Challenge of Standards" 11:15-12:30 American Ballroom
Southern Association and other standards and guidelines, legislation, funding of media programs in representative school districts. Presiding--
Robert Titus, Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University
Zella Lewis, Coordinator of Library Services, Tyler ISD
Ed Burleson, Superintendent, Lindale ISD
LuOuida Vinson Phillips, Director, Media and Library Services, Dallas ISD
Patsy Bolen, Director, Curriculum Development, Instructional Services, Dallas ISD
Lyle Froese, Director of Instructional Media, Sherman ISD

12:30

Buffet Luncheon--Speakers: Members of the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education William Truax, Dean, College of Education, East Texas State University: "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Proposed Learning Resources Specialist Professional Certification?" Barry Thompson, Head, Department of Secondary and Higher Education, East Texas State University: "How Does the State Board of Examiners View the Priority of Instructional Resources?" Introductions--Inez Johnson, Associate Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University	Texas Ballroom
"Public School Instructional Resources System and State Priority" 2:00-2:45 George Lipscomb, Director, Division of Instructional Resources, Texas Education Agency. Introduction--Loyd Guidry, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University	American Ballroom
"School Certification Programs That Affect School Media Programs" 2:45-3:30 Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development. Introduction--Donald Coker, Assistant Dean and Certifying Officer, College of Education, East Texas State University	American Ballroom
Group feedback and summary 3:30-4:00 Bruce Ledford, Assistant Professor, Center for Educational Media and Technology, East Texas State University	American Ballroom

Appendix B

Learning Resources Conference - December 15, 1975
Center for Educational Media and Technology
East Texas State University

13 Questions

1. How can application of standards and guidelines help students in the public schools?

2. How can employment of a certified learning resources specialist help students in the public schools?

3. What should be the relationships between teachers and the learning resources specialist?

4. What should the school administrator expect from the certified learning resources specialist?

5. What should the learning resources specialist expect from the administrator?

6. What should the universities and the state certification agency guarantee in terms of the competencies of the certified learning resources specialist?

7. What are the challenges of standards and guidelines for the public schools?

8. What is included in TEA's priority for learning resources programs?

9. How does the State Board of Examiners view the proposed learning resources specialist professional certification?

10. How does the State Board of Examiners view the state priority of instructional resources?

11. How do competencies for teacher certification affect school media programs?

12. How can a school better utilize their regional centers? their state services? other networks?

13. Who is to finance improved learning resources programs?

Appendix C

A NATIONAL STANDARDS PUZZLE

Presented by

Dr. Lou Correll and Dr. Earle Williams
Center for Educational Media and Technology
East Texas State University

```
A T H E A B C D M E D I A C D S P R O G R A M T U V W X A R
P C E A D E F G E H I I J K L C M N O P Q R S A B C D E B E
U A A B B C D E D F S T A T E H M E D I A P R O G R A M C G
B G D C H I J K I L T M N O P O Q R S T U V W X Y Z A B D I
L C O D E F G H A I R J K L M O N O P Q R S T U V W X J M O
I A F X Y Z J F R E I J K L M L J K L M N O P Q R S T U E N
C C S R F A F G S T C C D E F G H I J P S D L N O P Q R D A
A B C D G E F E P H T I J K L M N M O U P I R S T U A L I L
I X H H Z A B C E D E F G H N E T W O R K S I J K L B C A X
N N O I P Q R S C T M U V W X D Y Z A C B T D E F G C D X M
F J O K L M N O I P E Q R S T I U V W H X R Z A B C D E T E
O L L X M E D I A L D J K L A A N O A A I I T U E V E L E D
R B M C D F S T L T I P R O G R A M S S A C C D E F F G C I
M H E I J K L M I N A O P Q R P S M A I N T E N A N C E H A
A A D B C D E F S G H I J K L R M N O N P Q R S T U V W N X
T J I K L M N O T P P Q R S T O V W X G Y M A B C D E F I P
I G A H I J K L M N R O P Q R G S T U V W E Y Z A B M C C R
O B P L A N N I N G O C D E F R G H I J K D M N O P E O I O
N B R C D E F G H I G J K L M A N O P Q R I T U V W D L A G
P R O D U C T I O N R A B C D M E D I A E A I D E F I L N R
A B G D E F G H I J A K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y A E M A
J K R C D E F G H I M E D I A S P E C I A L I S T B E C D M
L J A D S T U B W X Y Z A B C D E F G H I D K L M N V T C S
V L M D I S T R I C T A N D S C H O O L K I M N O P A I L T
A C C E S S A N D D E L I V E R Y R S T S R W X Y L L O E U
T P R O G R A M X E V A L U A T I O N T U E X Y Z T U N G V
N Y S E L E C T I O N P O L I C I E S X V C G L Y M A S P W
Y K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z A B C D T E G H I T J T X
B U D G E T I N G K L M N O P Q R S T U R O G H I O I T M Y
C D E F K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z A R C D E F O K L Z
F U N C T I O N A L F L E X I B L E S P A C E S X Y N C E C
```

PROGRAMS: The Media Program, District Media Program, School Media Program, Regional Media Program, State Media Program, Networks

PERSONNEL: Media Specialist, Media Technician, Media Aide, District Media Director, Head of the School Media Program

OPERATION: Planning, Budgeting, purchasing, Production, Access and Delivery, Maintenance, Public Information, Program Evaluation

COLLECTIONS: Selection Policies, Media Evaluation

FACILITIES: Functional Flexible Spaces

Appendix D

List of Conferees

Akins, Frances
Library Coordinator, Lubbock ISD

Baker, Virginia
Director of Library Services, Lindale ISD

Barr, Clifton
Media Director, Waxahachie ISD

Beacham, Bill
Director of Media Services, Tyler ISD

Bearden, Dr. Keith
Director of Instruction, Greenville ISD

Bell, Jo Ann
Library Coordinator, Richardson ISD

Bertalan, Dr. Frank
Dean, School of Library Science, Texas Woman's University

Botelho, Maxine
Library Coordinator, Northside ISD, San Antonio

Boyvey, Dr. Mary
Program Director Divison of Instructional Resources, TEA

Burleson, Ed
Superintendent, Lindale ISD

Burt, Dr. Lesta
Director of Library Science, Sam Houston State University

Burt, Wayne
Huntsville

Carroll, Dr. Dewey E.
Dean of the School of Library and Information Science
North Texas State University

Castleberry, Judy
Media Consultant, Region XX ESC, San Antonio

Champion, Frances
Supervisor, Instructional Media, Wichita Falls ISD

Choate, Chuck
EMT Student, ETSU

Clarke, Virginia
    Library Science Faculty, North Texas State University

Coker, Donald
    Assistant Dean,College of Education, East Texas State University

Constande, Rosa
    Librarian, Hunt County Schools

Copeland, Mike
    Media Coordinator, Arlington ISD

Correll, Dr. Lou
    EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Cranfill, Jauquita
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

Crooks, Roger
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

D'Angelo, John
    Coordinator Instructional Services, Region X ESC Richardson

Dees, David
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

DeHart, Blake
    Elementary School Principal, Denton ISD

Dennis, Nathan
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

Dickerman, William
    Autotutorial Coordinator, University of Houston-Clear Lake City

Dowdle, Thelma
    Media Coordinator, Garland ISD

Dunlap, Jean
    Librarian, Dallas ISD

Echols, Dan
    Dean, Instructional Technology, Tarrant County Junior College

Elliott, Charlynne
    Media Director, Sherman ISD

Evans, John
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

Fillman, Tony
High school Principal, Sherman ISD

Ford, Dr. Harlan
Deputy Commissioner Programs/Personnel, TEA

Fowler, Bill
Coordinator, Instructional Media Technology, Tarrant County Junior College

Froese, Lyle
Director of Instructional Media, Sherman ISD

Frost, Robert
Assistant Director of Media, Tarrant County Junior College

Fry, Betsy
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Gadzella, Bernadette
Psychology faculty, East Texas State University

Gay, Nancy
Special Education Student, East Texas State University

Geery, Phil
Audio-Visual Director, McAllen ISD

Gray, Paul
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Greve, Dr. Clyde
Library Science Faculty, Sam Houston State University

Greve, Mrs. Mary
Library Science Faculty, Sam Houston State University

Guidry, Dr. Loyd
EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Hall, Dr. John
Coordinator, Guidance and Curriculum, Region VII ESC, Kilgore

Hartwig, Rudy
Instructional Facilitator, Dallas ISD

Hays, Bob
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Henry, Marion
Director of the Learning Resources Center
Prairie View A & M University

Hickox, Charles
Assistant Library Director, Tarrant County Junior College

Hill, Ernest
Director of Instructional Services, Dallas County Schools

Holifield, Dr. Bill
Curriculum Director, Plano ISD

Holland, Kathryn
EMT Student, East Texas State University

January, Mike
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Jennerich, Dr. Edward
Chairman, Library Science Department, Baylor University

Johnson, Dr. Bettye
LRC Director, College of Education, Texas Tech University

Johnson, Dr. Inez
EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Johnson, Leroy
Assistant Director, Instructional Services, Fort Worth ISD

Kahler, June
Resources Librarian, Fort Worth ISD

King, Dr. Dwade
Assistant Superintendent, Instruction, McAllen ISD

Kitchens, Larry
Media Director, Texas Wesleyan College

Knight, Kay
Elementary School Principal, Lubbock ISD

Kunkle, Dr. Josephine
Library Science Faculty, Texas Woman's University

Lankford, Linda
Elementary school librarian, Dallas ISD

Lankford, Mary
Media Coordinator, Irving ISD

Ledford, Dr. Bruce
    EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Lee, Susan
    Media Specialist, Region VII ESC, Kilgore

Lewis, Zella
    Coordinator of Library Services, Tyler ISD

Lilley, Dr. Dorothy B.
    EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Lipford, Mary Ann
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

Lipscomb, George
    Director, Instructional Services Division, TEA

Lyons, Arland
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

McCleskey, Margaret
    Director, Library Services, Arlington ISD
McDaniel, Mrs.Marty McDaniel, Coordinator of Career Education, Commerce
McDowell, F. H. (Bub)
    President, East Texas State University

Mandina, Genevieve
    Director Curriculum, Commerce ISD

Meyer, Dr. Richard C.
    Vice President for Academic Affairs, East Texas State University

Miller, Dr. Laurence
    Library Director, East Texas State University

Mills, Patricia
    Director Special Education, McKinney ISD

Mims, Lynn
    EMT Student, East Texas State University

Monroe, Dr. Hamilton
    Library Science Faculty, North Texas State University

Moss, Mary
    Language Arts Coordinator, Mesquite ISD

Murphy, Dr. Beatrice
    Director, Educational Media and Technology, East Texas
    State University

Nicosia, Dr. Al
Coordinator AV Education, Texas Woman's University

Pace, Mary Loese
Curriculum Coordinator, Mesquite ISD

Partin, Jimmy
Elementary Coordinator, Nacogdoches ISD

Pearson, Jody
Media Specialist, Region VII ESC, Kilgore

Pederson, Otis
Administrative Assistant Curriculum, Arlington ISD

Pfister, Dr. Fred
Library Science Faculty, North Texas State University

Pomroy, Jon
Media Director, Region X ESC, Richardson

Raines, Doris
EMT Staff, East Texas State University

Reedy, Melvin
Instructional Facilitator, Dallas ISD

Roach, Maggie
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Rose, Sue
Assistant Library Coordinator, Arlington ISD

Rusk, Dr. Paul
Library Science Faculty, Our Lady of the Lake College

Shackles, Jack
Consultant AV Services, Lubbock ISD

Sitton, Mildred
Secondary Coordinator, Nacogdoches ISD

Spence, Dr. Betty
Media Consultant, Mesquite ISD

Stansbury, Kay
Coordinator Technical Services, Tarrant County Junior College

Stearns, Joe
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Wichita Falls ISD

Summers, Valerie
Educational Technology Student, Texas A & M

Sumner, Jeanette
Director Learning Resource Center, Henderson County Jr. College

Swingler, Murlene
Media Specialist, Region VII ESC, Kilgore

Tayler, Faynelle
Library Supervisor, Mount Pleasant ISD

Taylor, James
Media Director, Region XX ESC, San Antonio

Teasley, Elizabeth
Library Coordinator, Denton ISD

Thompson, Dr. Sam
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Irving ISD

Thorn, Elois
Consultant, Special Education, Galveston, ISD

Tillerson, Robbie
Library Coordinator, Plano ISD

Titus, Dr. Robert
EMT faculty, East Texas State University

Thompson, Dr. Barry
Secondary and Higher Education Faculty, East Texas State University

Townsend, Dennis
Director of Instruction, Daingerfield ISD

Truax, Dr. William

Dean, College of Education, East Texas State University

Tucker, Bill
Associate Dean, Eastfield Community College

Turner, Dr. Frank
Library Science Faculty, Texas Woman's University

Ueoka, Travis
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Vagt, J. Paul
District Director, Learning Resources, Tarrant County Jr. College

Vaughan, Wilma
Supervisor, Terrell ISD

Venters, Rufus
Librarian, Waxachachie ISD

Wheeler, Dr. Mary
EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Wigley, Ruth
Librarian, Cooper ISD

Wilkerson, Mary
Certification Officer, East Texas State University

Williams, Earle
EMT Faculty, East Texas State University

Williams, Jan
EMT Student, East Texas State University

Wilson, Dorothy
Library Science Faculty, Prairie View A & M

Winder, A. H.
Media Director, Arlington ISD

Witmer, John
Media Center Director, Sherman ISD

Wright, Mike
EMT Student, East Texas State University